DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 786 EC 301 719

AUTHOR	Houck, Cherry Kendrick
TITLE	Special Education Integration-Unification Initiative for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities: An Investigation of Program Status and Impact. Final Report: Project R117E10145, August 15, 1991-August 14, 1992.
INSTITUTION	Virginia Polytechnic Inst. and State Univ., Blacksburg. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Aug 92
CONTRACT	R117E10145
NOTE	489p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF02/PC20 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *Delivery Systems; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Labeling (of Persons); *Learning Disabilities; *Mainstreaming; *Regular and Special Education Relationship; Resource Room Programs; School Districts; Social Integration; State Surveys; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Virginia

ABSTRACT

This final report focused on research questions associated with reducing the segregation of students with learning disabilities (LD) in Virginia. A survey of special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary and secondary education teachers, LD teachers, students with LD, and parents was conducted and followed by interviews, observations, analysis of achievement data, and document reviews. Specifically, the study examined: (1) the current status and process of increased integration; (2) factors that serve as the basis for or reluctance for such change; (3) evidence of perceived and actual outcomes of integration activities already undertaken; and (4) obstacles to the implementation of an integration model. The study found extensive efforts to increase the amount of time students with LD spend in the general classroom setting, especially at the elementary level, throughout Virginia; a lack of formally adopted guidelines, philosophies, or policies; a lack of systematic monitoring or evaluation plans; doubts about the ability or willingness of regular teachers to meet these students' special needs; general support for "pull-out" programs; and differing opinions on reduction of stigma in integrated programs. Avoiding embarrassment was a major consideration in student preferences. Extensive tables (91) and exhibits (14) provide details. (DB)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ED352786

Special Education Integration-Unification Initiative for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities: An Investigation of Program Status and Impact

Final Report: Project R117E10145
(Educational Research Grant Program: Field-Initiated Studies
August 15, 1991 - August 14, 1992)

Cherry Kendrick Houck
Principal Investigator

College of Education
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061-0313
(703) 232-5269/FAX (703) 231-3717

Graduate Assistants

Sandra Dill
Catherine Rogers
Kelley Altis
and
Dove Robinson, Project Secretary

August 1992

EC 301719

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements .... **iii**

Table of Tables .... **v**

Table of Exhibits .... **xv**

Abstract .... **xvii**

Introduction **19**

Overview of the Investigation **25**
  Research Questions 25

Project Design, Methodology, and Instrumentation **31**
Project Phases 31
Instrumentation 33
  Mail Survey: Supervisors of Special Education. 34
  Mail Survey: G-Target Groups. 37
  Mail Survey: Parents of Students with Learning Disabilities 37
  Structured Interview: School Personnel 39
  Structured Interview: Parents with Learning Disabled Children 40
  Structured Interview: Students with Learning Disabilities 42
  Structured Observations in Integrated Classrooms 43

Subjects and Subject Selection Procedures **45**
  Participants in Mail Surveys 45
  Participants in Follow-up Interviews 47
  Preliminary Achievement Outcomes 49
  Assurance of Confidentiality/Anonymity 50

Data Entry and Analysis Procedures **51**

Results **53**
  Research Question 1 53
  Research Question 2 54
  Research Question 3 56
  Research Question 5 62
  Research Question 6 65
  Research Question 7 68
  Research Question 8 69
  Research Question 9 72
  Research Question 10 74
  Research Question 11 75
  Supplemental Findings from Follow-up Field Visits 79
  Supplemental Findings From Parent Groups 81

Discussion 83
  Conclusion 90

Project Evaluation 93

References 97

Tables and Exhibits 103

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement under the Educational Research Grant Program: Field-Initiated Studies CFDA No: 84.117E (R117E10145; August 15, 1991 - August 14, 1992). I wish to acknowledge the contributions of each individual who participated in the study and the school divisions hosting the follow-up field visits. In the rush of daily school routines, each contributed valuable time and personal perspectives. I also am grateful for the support provided by graduate assistants, Sandra Dill, Catherine Rogers, Kelley Altis, Gretchen Troutman, Jane Arrington and Dove Robinson, project secretary, and for the assistance of personnel in the University Measurement and Research Services who reviewed the survey instruments and processed electronic data entries. These individuals brought unique skills to the overall research efforts and contributed to the various research tasks. Finally, I thank the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement for sponsoring this investigation.

Cherry K. Houck
Principal Investigator

Table of Tables

Number	Title	Page
1	Survey Mailing Record	104
2	Overview of Professional Respondents' Characteristics	105
3	Overview of Surveys Sent and Returned	107
4	Record of Interviews Conducted During Follow-up Field Visits	108
5	Characteristics of Students Interviewed	109
6	Summary of Efforts to Increase Integration at the Elementary Level (Q1)	111
7	Summary of Efforts to Increase Integration at the Middle School Level (Q2)	112
8	Summary of Efforts to Increase Integration at the Secondary Level (Q3)	113
9	Reported Presence of Guidelines, Written Philosophies, and Policies Designed to Increase the Integration of Student with Specific Learning Disabilities	114
10	Special Education Supervisors' Report of the Extent that Specific Data Are Being Systematically Collected and Summarized on a School or System Basis for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities	115
11	Overall Summary of Personal Agreement with Statements Related to Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q5-21)	116

12 Summary of Special Education Supervisors' Personal Agreement with Statements Related to Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q5-21) 118

13 Summary of General Education Supervisors' Personal Agreement with Statements Related to Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q5-21) 120

14 Summary of Building Principals' Personal Agreement with Statements Related to Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q5-21) 122

15 Summary of General Elementary Education Teachers' Personal Agreement with Statements Related to Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q5-21) 124

16 Summary of General Secondary Education Teachers' Personal Agreement with Statements Related to Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q5-21) 126

17 Summary of Learning Disability Teachers' Personal Agreement with Statements Related to Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q5-21) 128

18 Summary of Parents' Personal Agreement with Common Survey Statements Regarding Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (From Parent Mail Survey) 130

19 Summary of Parents' Personal Agreement with Common Survey Statements Regarding Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (From Parent Interview) 132

20 Overall Summary of Factors Influencing Increased Integration Efforts for Serving Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q22-38) 134

21 Summary of Special Education Supervisors' Reports of Factors Serving as the Basis for Increased Integration Efforts for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q22-38) 136

22 Summary of General Education Supervisors' Reports of Factors Serving as the Basis for Increased Integration Efforts for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q22-38) 138

23 Summary of Building Principals' Reports of Factors Serving as the Basis for Increased Integration Efforts for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q22-38) 140

24 Summary of General Elementary Education Teachers' Reports of Factors Serving as the Basis for Increased Integration Efforts for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q22-38) 142

25 Summary of General Secondary Education Teachers' Reports of Factors Serving as the Basis for Increased Integration Efforts for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q22-38) 144

26 Summary of LD Teachers' Reports of Factors Serving as the Basis for Increased Integration Efforts for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q22-38) 146

27 Overall Summary of Factors Present to Support Increased Integration Efforts for Serving Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q39-44) 148

28 Summary of Special Education Supervisors' Reports of Factors Present to Support Program Change Efforts (Q39-44) 149

29 Summary of General Education Supervisors' Reports of Factors Present to Support Program Change Efforts (Q39-44). 150

30 Summary of Building Principals' Reports of Factors Present to Support Program 151

Program Change Efforts (Q39-44)

31 Summary of General Elementary Education Teachers' Reports of Factors Present to Support Program Change Efforts (Q39-44) 152

32 Summary of General Secondary Education Teachers' Reports of Factors Present to Support Program Change Efforts (Q39-44) 153

33 Summary of LD Teachers' Reports of Factors Present to Support Program Change Efforts (Q39-44) 154

34 Summary of Parents' Reports of Factors Present to Support Program Change Efforts (Mail Survey) 155

35 Preliminary Findings Related to Students' Academic Gains By Integration Efforts 156

36 Overall Summary of Observed Change Attributed to Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities in Academic Year 1991-1992 (Q45-57) 157

37 Summary of Changes Observed Attributed to Integration Efforts During Academic Year 1991-1992 (Q45-57): General Supervisors 158

38 Summary of Changes Observed Attributed to Integration Efforts During Academic Year 1991-1992 (Q45-57): Building Principals 159

39 Summary of Changes Observed Attributed to Integration Efforts During Academic Year 1991-1992 (Q45-57): General Elementary Education Teachers 160

40 Summary of Changes Observed Attributed to Integration Efforts During Academic Year 1991-1992 (Q45-57): General Secondary Education 161

41 Summary of Changes Observed Attributed to Integration Efforts During Academic Year 1991-1992 (Q45-57): LD Teachers 162

42 Summary of Parents' Observations of 163

Changes Associated with the Increased Time Their child Is Spending in the Classroom (From Parent Mail Survey)

43 Summary of Parents' Observations of Changes Associated with the Increased Time Their child Is Spending in the Regular Classroom (From Parent Interviews) 164

44 Summary of Findings From Student Interviews Conducted During Field Visits: Quantitative Findings 165

45 Summary of Elaborative Comments From Student Interviews Conducted During Field Visits 172

46 Overview of Reasons for Local Efforts to Increased Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Part II-Q58) 180

47 Overview of Obstacles to Increased Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Part II-Q59) 181

48 Overview of Reasons for No Active Efforts to Increased Use of the Integration Model for Student with Specific Learning Disabilities (Part II-Q60) 182

49 Reasons for Local Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Special Education Supervisors) 183

50 Reasons for Local Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (General Education Supervisors) 184

51 Reasons for Local Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Building Principals) 185

52 Reasons for Local Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (General 186

Elementary Education Teachers)

53 Reasons for Local Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (General Secondary Education Teachers) 187

54 Reasons for Local Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (LD Teachers) 188

55 Obstacles to Increased Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Special Education Supervisors) 189

56 Obstacles to Increased Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (General Education Supervisors) 190

57 Obstacles to Increased Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Building Principals) 191

58 Obstacles to Increased Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (General Elementary Education Teachers) 192

59 Obstacles to Increased Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (General Secondary Education Teachers) 193

60 Obstacles to Increased Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (LD Teachers) 194

61 Reasons for No Active Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Special Education Supervisors) 195

62 Reasons for No Active Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning 196

Disabilities (General Education Supervisors)

63 Reasons for No Active Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Building Principals) 197

64 Reasons for No Active Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (General Elementary Education Teachers)) 198

65 Reasons for No Active Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (General Secondary Education Teachers) 199

66 Reasons for No Active Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (LD Teachers) 200

67 Group Differences Related to Personal Agreement with Statements Regarding Use of the Integration Model for Serving Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q5-21) 201

68 Group Differences Related to Perceived Factors Influencing Increased Use of the Integration Model for Serving Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q22-38) 202

69 Group Differences Related to Attributes Perceived as Present to Support Increased Integration Efforts (Q39-44) 203

70 Group Differences Related to Changes Observed in Students with Learning Disabilities Served in Programs Using the Integration Model During Academic Year 1991-1992 (Q45-57) 204

71 Means and Standard Deviations for Significant ANOVAS (Q5-44) 205

72 Means and Standard Deviations for Significant ANOVA (Q45-57) 208

73 Results of Post Hoc Analysis for Significant ANOVAS Identifying Group Differences Across All Groups: Personal Agreement (Q5-21) 209

74 Results of Post Hoc Analysis for Significant ANOVAS Identifying Group Differences Across All Groups: Influencing Factors in Change (Q22-38) 213

75 Results of Post Hoc Analysis for Significant ANOVA Identifying Differences Across Groups: Observed Changes (Q56) 215

76 Group Differences for Personal Agreement Statements (Q5-21) Based on Reported Levels of Integration Efforts: Q1 (Elementary) 216

77 Group Differences for Personal Agreement Statements (Q5-21) Based on Reported Levels of Integration Efforts: Q2 (Middle School) 218

78 Group Differences for Personal Agreement Statements (Q5-21) Based on Reported Levels of Integration Efforts: Q2 (High School) 220

79 Item Frequencies and Means for Q5-21: Elementary 222

80 Item Frequencies and Means for Q5-21: Middle School 224

81 Item Frequencies and Means for Q5-21: High School 226

82 Means and Standard Deviations for Significant ANOVAS for Q5-21 By Integration Group Defined By Q1 228

83 Means and Standard Deviations for Significant ANOVAS for Q5-21 By Integration Group Defined By Q2 229

84 Means and Standard Deviations for Significant ANOVAS for Q5-21 By Integration Group Defined By Q3 230

85 Results of Post Hoc Analysis for Significant ANOVAS Identifying Group Differences Corresponding with Integration Efforts at Three Instructional Levels (Elementary (Q1), Middle (Q2), and High School (Q3) for Q5-21: Personal Agreement 231

86 Summary of Content for Selected Items from Parent Interviews Conducted During the follow-up Field Visits 234

87 Summary of Quantitative Findings From Parent Mail Survey 237

88 Reasons for Local Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (From Part II: Parent Mail Survey) 242

89 Obstacles for Increased Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (From Part II: Parent Mail Survey) 243

90 Reasons for No Active Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Serving Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (From Part II: Parent Mail Survey) 244

91 Parents' Concerns Related to Increased Integration Efforts (From Part II: Parent Mail Survey) 245

Table of Exhibits

Letter	Title	Page
A	Pre-Test Instrument Review Questionnaire: Special Education Supervisor's Mail Survey	246
B	Cover Letter and Survey Instrument: Special Education Supervisors	248
C	Cover Letters and Survey Instrument: General Supervisors, Building Principals General Elementary Education Teachers, General Secondary Education Teachers, and LD Teachers	255
D	Parent Pre-Test Respondent Questionnaire: Parent Mail Survey	262
E	Cover Letter and Survey Instrument: Parent Mail Survey	264
F	Instrument for Site Visits: School Personnel	273
G	Structured Interview Instrument for Site Visits: Parent Interview	287
H	Cover Letter, Permission Form, Subject Information Sheet and Structured Interview Instrument: Students with Learning Disabilities	295
I	Structured In-Class Observation Form	307
J	Letters Requesting Assistance in the Dissemination of Parent Mail Surveys with Guidelines for Selecting Parent Respondents for Mail Survey Participation	311
K	Correspondence Related to Arranging and Conducting the Field Visits	317
L	Overview of documents Submitted in Response	331

to Query Regarding Written Guidelines, Philosophies, or Policies Designed to Increase Integration

M Case Reports 333

N Overview of In-Class Observations Completed During the Follow-up Field Visits 361

Abstract

Special Education Integration-Unification Initiative for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities: An Investigation of Program Status and Impact

Recent calls for a reconceptualization of service delivery models that reduce the segregation of students with specific learning disabilities (and other disabling conditions) and create a more unified system responsive to all students' needs have resulted in much debate and dramatic programmatic changes. Proponents for such change believe that: (1) equally successful or superior outcomes can be achieved for students without the stigma associated with segregated programs, (2) students failing to thrive in the current general education programs but ineligible for special education services can benefit from increased collaboration of all school personnel, and (3) *integrated* or *unified* models permit greater cost efficiency. The need for careful scrutiny of this initiative and attention to important questions associated with the proposed *integration* or *unified* model has been voiced by professional and advocacy groups. Those expressing reservations point to: (1) the absence of sufficient empirical evidence supporting such changes, (2) the potential damage to students qualifying for special education services, and (3) doubts that general education teachers can and will provide sufficient accommodations for students with special education needs.

This study sought to: (1) capture the current status and process of what may prove to be the most significant change in services for students with specific

learning disabilities on a state-wide basis, (2) document factors that serve as the basis *for* or *reluctance for* such change, (3) provide preliminary evidence of perceived and actual outcomes of *integration* initiatives undertaken to date, and (4) identify obstacles to the implementation of an *integration* model. The investigation focused on 11 research questions as they relate to students eligible and receiving special education services under the category of learning disabilities in Virginia's public schools. A series of mail surveys followed by interviews, observations, extant achievement data, and document reviews were used to address the 11 questions. Common elements across survey questions permit response comparisons of the population of special education supervisors and a random statewide sample of general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary and secondary education teachers, and LD teachers employed in systems that *are* and *are not* actively attempting to implement the *integration* concept. Interviews with a subsample of educators representing these groups, a small sample of students with specific learning disabilities and a mail survey and field interviews of parents with children displaying learning disabilities provide insights to the reactions of these important *stakeholders*.

Descriptive statistics were generated to characterize findings from the various target groups and are presented herein along with findings from *open-ended* queries included to identify shared and group-specific views and concerns. Achievement scores from a small group of students with learning disabilities served in programs that *have* and *have not* initiated increased *integration* or *inclusion* efforts provide a preliminary, albeit crude, window to academic outcomes over a one-year period.

Introduction

Since 1976 - 77, the number of students with disabilities who receive specialized educational services has increased 21.2% to over 4.5 million students served during the 1987-88 school year. During this same period, the number of school age children and youth with learning disabilities has grown from 797,213 to over 1.9 million (National Council on Disabilities, 1989; U.S. Dept. of Education, 1989). These dramatic increases have brought charges of over-identification, misidentification, and questions regarding the validity of learning disabilities as a distinct construct (Algozzine & Ysseldyke, 1986; Coles, 1989; Collier & Hoover, 1987; Gartner, 1986; Ross, 1990; Shepard, 1983). At the same time, there is great concern for many other students (presumably without disabilities) who are failing to thrive in current general educational programs (Adelman, 1989; Adelman & Taylor, 1986; Pianta, 1990).

To address these concerns, a number of professionals (e.g., Doyle & LaGrasta, 1988; Hauptman, 1982, Gartner, 1986; Gartner & Lipsky, 1989; Jenkins, Pious, & Peterson, 1988; Reynolds, Wang & Walberg, 1987; Wang & Reynolds, 1985; Wang & Walberg, 1988; Stainback & Stainback, 1984; 1987; Will, 1986) suggest that students with learning disabilities and other handicapping conditions would be better (and more efficiently) served in general education classrooms with the support of special education personnel. Here, all students with learning difficulties (not necessarily disabilities) could benefit without the stigma associated with segregated programming. This controversial concept, promoted under the terms *Regular Education Initiative (REI)* and *integrated* or *unified* programming, is being adopted and implemented in school systems on the basis of proponents' optimism for: (1) successful outcomes without the stigma associated with segregated programs, (2) broad-spread benefits to all students, and (3) greater cost efficiency through a merger of all school resources in one unified effort. Key to this perspective is the belief that ownership for learning difficulties should be taken from the shoulders of the students and recast as an educational mismatch requiring a well-coordinated, unified intervention effort (Gartner & Lipsky, 1989).

Evidence of this initiative may be seen in:

1. the growing number of system documents (e.g., New York City Board of Education's Special Education Report: *Special Education and A Changing Policy*, 1989 & California's *General Education/Special Education Interface Task Force Report*, 1988);
2. the extensive number of publications and presentations cited in the ERIC and RIE database that focus on the relationship between regular and special education (e.g., Affleck, Madge, Adams, & Lowenbraun, 1988; Jenkins, Pious, & Peterson, 1988);
3. priority funding for efforts such as the synthesis project, *Synthesis on Research in Educating Children with Handicaps in the General Education Setting* initiated by the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (cited in Smith, 1988), and
4. reports coming from the focused research initiative sponsored by the Division of Innovation and Development, U.S. Department of

Education's Office of Special Education Programs (e.g., see reports from Cooper & Speece, 1990; Nowecek, McKinney & Hallahan, 1990; Schulte, Osborne, & McKinney, 1990, Zigmond & Baker, 1990, and an overview presented by Kaufman, Kameenui, Birman, & Danielson, 1990).

Clearly, these calls for change are, in part, due to the heightened focus on education, educational reform, and the staggering budget deficits at every governing level.

Proponents' optimism has been tempered by calls for careful attention to many unanswered questions related to the *REI*. Position statements concerning this initiative have been prepared by organizations including the *National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities* (1982; 1991), the *Division of Learning Disabilities* (1986), and the *Association for Children and Adults with Learning Disabilities* -- now *LDA* (1986). Along with position statements, a number of professionals have expressed specific concerns related to:

1. the absence of sufficient empirical evidence to support such programmatic changes (Anderegg & Vergason, 1987; Fuchs & Fuchs, 1988; Kauffman, Gerber, & Semmel, 1988; Keogh 1990; Martin, 1987; McKinney & Hocutt, 1988; Wagner, 1990; Wiederholt, 1989; Zigmond & Baker, 1990);
2. fear that the movement toward integrated services (through increased "general" education placements) will cause students with specific learning disabilities (and other handicapping conditions) to be unserved or inadequately served (Lerner, 1987); and,
3. doubts of the extent that general education teachers can and will accommodate the special needs of students with learning disabilities with

increased integration (Bryan, Bay & Donahue, 1988; Byrnes, 1990; Kauffman, Gerber, & Semmel, 1988; Lieberman, 1985; McKinney & Hocutt, 1988).

It is fair to say that the *REI/integration* initiative has generated much debate along with a call for closer scrutiny of this dramatic policy shift. Regarding the need for close scrutiny, Martin noted that "... (a)n appropriate public policy for the present should be a very conservative one, seeking to gather scientifically valid information, well replicated in a number of studies by different researchers and quite consistent. This is preferable to making wholesale attempts to change educational practices affecting millions of children on the basis of scant research information, even thought there is an interesting philosophy taken at face value behind these changes" (1987, p.14). Gartner and Lipsky advise that "...the focus of the scrutiny must be on outcomes for students... The scarce resources of public funds and trust and, most importantly, student needs, demand no less" (1989, p. 29).

Admitting that it is a fantasy to believe that policy change is derived from empirical findings rather than being driven by social-political forces, Keogh (1990) suggests that "...when focused on educational reform, it is clear that one major responsibility of the research community is to study systematically and comprehensively the implementation of change" (p.186). The research reported herein responds to the need for further documentation of the extent to which policy and program changes to achieve greater levels of *integration* are occurring, attributes of the change process, and perceived and actual outcomes of such change.

Overview of the Investigation

Through previous research, the principal investigator, along with several colleagues, has conducted research to document the status of learning disability programs in Virginia and perceptions of needed change (Houck, Engelhard, & Geller, 1990; Houck, Geller, & Engelhard, 1988; Houck & Given, 1981), and has described a participatory model for program improvement (Billingsley & Houck, 1988). The objectives of this study were to: (1) ascertain the current status and process of what may prove to be the most significant change in services for students with specific learning disabilities on a statewide basis, (2) document factors that serve as the basis *for* or *reluctance for* such change, (3) provide evidence of actual and perceived outcomes of *integration* initiatives undertaken to date, and (4) identify obstacles to implementation of an *integration* model. Collectively, these findings provide a "snapshot" of programmatic change related to the recent *integration* or *inclusion* initiatives in one state and serve as a baseline for gauging *stakeholders'* responses and the impact of these changes across time.

Research Questions

This inquiry focused on 11 primary research questions as they relate to students who have been determined eligible and are recipients of special education services under the category of specific learning disabilities in Virginia's public schools. To the extent possible, common queries were included across target groups to permit response comparisons. The following questions served as the focus of the investigation:

1. To what extent do special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general education teachers, LD teachers, and parents of students with learning disabilities in Virginia report that their school division is *actively* attempting to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in general education classrooms beyond recent practice?

2. To what extent do special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers, and LD teachers in Virginia report that their system has adopted any guidelines, written philosophies, or policies which are designed specifically *to increase* the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the general education classroom?

3. To what extent do special education supervisors report the following accountability/monitoring measures are available to document the educational outcomes of students with learning disabilities on a system-wide basis in Virginia's school divisions?

    - standardized measures of academic achievement,
    - absenteeism,
    - grade retention,
    - dropout rate(s),
    - rate of diplomas granted,
    - students' attitudes toward learning and school,
    - grades for each grading period,
    - students' satisfaction in school placement,
    - social acceptance within the general education settings,
    - parental satisfaction with the educational program provided for their child with a learning disability,
    - number of referrals for special education services,
    - the number of students with learning disabilities in each program delivery option each school year,
    - educational costs in the delivery of services for students with specific learning disabilities.

4. To what extent do special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general education teachers, LD teachers, and parents within Virginia's school systems that are *actively* attempting

to implement the *REI* or *integration* model to serve students with specific learning disabilities (and perhaps other disabilities) *personally agree* with the following statements?

- The integration model reduces the stigma associated with learning disabilities.
- Equal or superior learning opportunities are available for students with specific learning disabilities when the *integration model* is used.
- Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.
- Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.
- The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the *integration model.*
- Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.
- Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.
- Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.
- "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.
- Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities through use of the integration model.
- Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.
- School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
- Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
- External consultants and/or experts have recommended movement to an *integration* model for students with specific learning disabilities.
- Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.
- The integration model results in a *genuine* sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.
- Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.

5. To what extent do special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general education teachers, and LD teachers within Virginia's school systems that are *actively* attempting to

implement the *REI* or *integration* model to serve students with specific learning disabilities (and perhaps other disabilities) *report* the following factors or justifications as the basis for implementation of policy and programmatic changes within their school division?

- The integration model reduces the stigma associated with learning disabilities.
- Students with specific learning disabilities have equal or superior learning opportunities when the integration model is used.
- Educational costs are reduced through use of the integration model.
- The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.
- Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.
- Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.
- Regular/general educators are able to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.
- Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.
- "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.
- Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities through use of the integration model.
- Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.
- School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
- Local parents have encouraged use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
- External consultants and/or experts have recommended movement to an *integration* model for students with specific learning disabilities.
- Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.
- The integration model results in a *genuine* sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.
- Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.

6. To what extent do special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general education teachers, LD teachers, and parents report the following factors, often associated with successful

change efforts, have been present within schools attempting to implement an increased *integration* model?

- Involvement of key stakeholders (i.e., central administrators, supervisors, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementing integration efforts,
- Establishment of realistic goals for integration,
- Clear articulation of goals for integration,
- Flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual school due to the presence of the unique school characteristics,
- Access to necessary resources and support for integration, and
- A systematic process for evaluating the process and outcome of the integration effort.

7. What are the academic outcomes (i.e., basic skills as measured by standardized assessment procedures) for a preliminary sample of students with specific learning disabilities for the 1991-92 academic year in Virginia school divisions that *have* and *have not* adopted and implemented the *REI* or *integrated* service delivery model? (Although academic achievement is only one of education's many valued goals, this *narrow* focus was selected for this pilot inquiry based on practicality and to limit the overall scope of the investigation.)

8. What changes have general education supervisors, building principals, general education teachers, LD teachers, and parents of students with learning disabilities observed regarding the following outcome measures for students with specific learning disabilities that are attributed to the school or school division's integration efforts during the 1991-92 school year?

- LD students' standardized measures of academic achievement,
- LD students' grades for each grading period,
- LD students' attitudes toward learning and school,

- LD students' satisfaction in school placement,
- LD students' social acceptance within the regular education setting,
- Parental satisfaction with the educational program provided for their child with a learning disability,
- Absenteeism for LD students,
- Anticipated grade promotion rate for LD students,
- Dropout rate for LD students,
- anticipated Rate of diplomas granted to LD students,

and other anticipated outcomes including

- Number of referrals for special education services, and
- Availability of appropriate educational services for students with learning disabilities,
- Cost efficiency in the delivery of services for students with learning disabilities.

9. What do students with learning disabilities report regarding the nature of their intervention program, their feelings of social acceptance, comfort, and success, their preferences related to where special support is provided, future plans, and suggestions for program improvement?

10. What are considered to be: (a) the primary motivating factors for increased integration efforts, (b) primary reasons for not seeking to implement the integration model, and (c) obstacles cited by special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general education teachers, LD teachers, and parents of students with specific learning disabilities within systems that *have* and *have not* sought to implement an *integrated* model to serve students with specific learning disabilities (and perhaps other disabilities)?

11. What, if any, differences exist for responses to common survey items across target and integration activity groups?

Project Design, Methodology, and Instrumentation

The investigation was conducted over a one-year period commencing August 15, 1991 and extending through August 14, 1992. Research tasks were partitioned into four phases to facilitate coordination with the public school calendar. An overview of tasks completed within each phase follows.

Project Phases

Phase I

1. Identify and appoint project personnel;
2. Review research design and timelines for overall project;
3. Contact key Virginia Department of Education personnel to notify them of project funding, project scope, and to initiate a request for access to the State Personnel Data Tapes;
4. Update literature review;
5. Review data reduction/data analysis procedures;
6. Develop and *refine* data collection instrument for soliciting information from special education supervisors;
7. Submit the draft survey instrument to the Director of Virginia Tech's Research and Measurement Services for technical review.
8. Revise survey instrument;
9. Obtain current address file for special education supervisors from the Virginia Department of Education;
10. Prepare letter of explanation and request for participation for special education administrators/supervisors in Virginia, and
11. Develop a subject identification code.

Phase II

1. Conduct survey of Virginia's special education supervisors;
2. Develop and *refine* data collection instrument and accompanying materials for addressing the research questions for the remaining school personnel target groups;

3. Field-test and refine the developed instrument for the other school target groups;
4. Enter responses to the *open-form* queries in Part II of the supervisors' mail survey in ASKSAM database;
5. Analyze data and prepare summary report of findings from the special education supervisors' survey;
6. Identify systems that *are* and *are not* seeking to implement an *integration* model based on the responses of special education supervisors to question one;
7. Identify in-system samples for addressing the research questions directed to general supervisors, building principals, general classroom teachers, and LD teachers;
8. Conduct the survey of general supervisors, building principals, general classroom teachers, and LD teachers;
9. Develop the student and parent interview and parent mail survey instruments;
10. Generate address database for persons requesting research findings;
11. Field-test and refine the developed student and parent instruments;
12. Identify representative systems for follow-up field visits;
13. Develop procedures and instruments for scheduling and conducting the field visits;
14. Prepare courtesy packets of materials related to the field visits;
15. Conduct field visits to representative school systems, and
16. Enter responses to the *open-form* queries in Part II of the mail surveys in ASKSAM database.

Phase III

1. Request and obtain permission to conduct the mail parent survey;
2. Send follow-up letters requesting student achievement data for academic year 1991-92 to systems offering data, and
3. Collect and summarize academic achievement outcomes for the 1991-92 academic year from participating school divisions;

Phase IV

1. "Read in" OpScan data sheets to generate SAS database;
2. Conduct mail parent survey;
3. Enter responses to the follow-up interviews of school personnel and parents in the ASKSAM database;
4. Enter responses to *closed* and *open-form* queries in Part II of the parents' mail survey in ASKSAM database;
5. Enter responses to *closed* and *open-form* queries on the student interview in ASKSAM and SAS databases;
6. Update literature review and prepare summary tables;
7. Collect and summarize student achievement data;
8. Analyze data and prepare summary report of findings;
9. Prepare case reports of programs participating in the follow-up field visits;
10. Refine data management system;
11. Prepare and submit final report to sponsor;

12. Develop dissemination plan for project-related products;
13. Disseminate project findings to key individuals and groups and participants requesting research findings, and
14. Close project account and files.

Instrumentation

A number of instruments and related data collection materials (e.g., letters of explanation and request for participation, permission forms, sampling guidelines, forms for recording student achievement data, etc.) were developed to address the various research questions. Among these were (a) the mail survey for special education supervisors, (b) the mail survey for general education supervisors, building principals, general education teachers, and LD teachers (termed the general or G-target survey), (c) the mail survey for parents of students with learning disabilities, (d) the field visit interview and observation instruments for use with school personnel, (e) the student interview instrument, and (f) the parent interview instrument.

The major portions of the mail surveys sent to supervisors of special education and the G-target groups were structured as *closed form* Likert-type response items presented on a two-sided recording sheet that could be scanned electronically. This format was chosen to minimize error introduced by manual recoding and to reduce data entry costs.

Adherence to the following standards (where applicable) was considered in the development of the survey and interview instruments:

- Consistency with the proposed research focus,
- Straightforward directions,
- Item clarity and brevity,
- Use of vocabulary sensitive to group characteristics,

- Unbiased, non-threatening presentation of items,
- Use of items requesting a single response,
- Suitability of response choices,
- Compatibility with two-sided OpScan record sheets,
- Grouping/sequencing of items to facilitate the respondents' task,
- Commonality of items across instruments, where appropriate, and
- Coding to facilitate data summarization, subject identification, and record tracking and retrieval.

Prior to the actual survey, small groups of individuals representing the various target groups were asked to review the survey and interview instruments to identify problems related to clarity of questions, unnecessary redundancy, offensive wording, and/or other problems that could influence accuracy, ease, and rate of response. A description of the procedures used for these pilot tests follows.

Mail Survey: Supervisors of Special Education.

The original survey for special education supervisors was developed to address research questions 1-6 and 10, adhering to the relevant standards cited above. The investigators reviewed instruments described in published reports of similar investigations. The pilot instrument consisted of subject information, 59 *closed-form* items, and three *open-form* items. *Closed-form* (Part I) items were designed to establish: (a) the extent of active integration efforts within each school division, (b) the presence of any guidelines, written philosophies, or policies designed to increase the time students with learning disabilities spend in the general education classroom, (c) the extent of personal agreement with 17 statements related to the integration initiative, (d) the availability of various data that might serve as an index to outcomes, (e) perceptions regarding the extent that factors related to the 17 previously cited statements served as the basis for the integration initiative, and (f) the extent that various supports for program change were present during efforts to increase use of the integration model. Items were arranged on the front and back of a 60 item OpScan form that could be folded. *Open-form* items (Part II) asked respondents to identify: (a) what they considered be the *primary* or *basic reason(s)* for their system's efforts to implement the integration model to serve students with specific learning disabilities, (b) *primary reasons* for not implementing the model if their system had not undertaken such efforts, (c) *major obstacles* to implementation of the integration model for serving students with specific learning disabilities. Participants also were asked to submit relevant documents for review. Space for requesting a copy of the research findings and for obtaining some information about the respondents was included.

The instrument was reviewed internally by the University's Office of Measurement and Research Services for technical accuracy and appearance, and suggested revisions were made. Subsequently, the survey materials were reviewed externally by eight North Carolina educators from five school systems representing rural and suburban/urban communities. These individuals included one elementary and one middle school principal, one general education and one LD teacher at the elementary level, three special education directors, and one superintendent. All reviewers were instructed to read the letter of explanation and complete the survey (Parts I & II). They were instructed to look at the survey materials critically, and to make recommendations for change, keeping in mind characteristics of the intended users and the group that they represented. Reviewers also were asked to note the time required to complete the survey and to remain for a short follow-up discussion.

A Pretest Respondent Questionnaire was distributed to guide the follow-up discussion and to record suggestions. This questionnaire (see Exhibit A) related to standards such as clarity, bias, use of specialized vocabulary, appearance, comprehensiveness, and format desirability. Reactions were recorded by project staff for use in instrument revision. The average amount of time needed for completion of the survey was 20 minutes.

The reviewers indicated that information compiled from the survey would be of interest and importance to them but recommended that the cover letter be shortened and the language simplified in some places. As a result, changes in wording were made to improve clarity and precision in 14 items. Two items relating to observed outcomes were dropped because data necessary for answering the questions were judged to be inaccessible to respondents without some research. In addition, a response choice was added to questions 22-34 based on the group's recommendations and items were re-ordered to begin with those requiring less thought and to facilitate the respondent's task. Members of the pilot group also recommended that each item be aligned with the corresponding number on the OpScan sheet. Although item length prevented this accommodation, an arrow was added to direct respondents to the response area for item one. Print size was also increased.

To heighten survey recipients' motivation to respond, reviewers suggested that a small incentive be included and that follow-up mailings be planned. Based on these suggestions, incentives valued at approximately $0.10 each (i.e., individual tea bags, Christmas candies, and small seed packets) were included in the original and two follow-up mailings and paid for by the principal investigator.

The final version of the survey instrument, cover letter requesting participation, and postage-paid return envelop were mailed to 132 individuals identified by the Virginia Department of Education as the designated special education supervisor for all school divisions (see Exhibit B). Parts I and II were pre-coded to enable tracking of returned and unreturned surveys.

Mail Survey: G-Target Groups.

Minor changes were made in the instrument sent to supervisors of special education for use with the G-target groups. Modifications involved rewording directions and item stems to fit the target groups, and the addition of a request for respondents to indicate changes observed in students and services resulting from increased integration efforts during the 1991-92 school year. The final instrument included 57*closed-form* and eight *open-form* items. Parts I and II were pre-coded to enable tracking of returned and unreturned surveys. The surveys were mailed along with a cover letter, incentive, and postage-paid return envelopes (see Exhibit C). Two follow-up mailings containing a revised cover letter, survey materials, and a return envelop were sent to increase return rates. The mailing dates and number of surveys used in each mailing are presented in Table 1.

Mail Survey: Parents of Students with Learning Disabilities

The original version of the parent survey was developed to correspond, where appropriate, with the surveys sent to school personnel. Items were designed to elicit information regarding: (a) the child's current grade placement, (b) the respondent's relationship to the child, (c) the type and extent of special education services being provided to their child, (d) the extent of active integration efforts within their child's school, (e) parental preference regarding the delivery of special education services, (f) the nature of their child's learning disability, (g) the extent of personal agreement with selected statements related to the integration initiative, (h) the frequency of accommodations in school and homework assignments and ability of the child to complete homework assignments, (i) views regarding the extent that their child will be prepared for independent living and employment, (j) noted changes in their child's educational outcomes or access to needed support services, (k) the extent that various supports to change were present during efforts to increase use of the integration model, (l) primary reasons for their child's school being or not being engaged in integration efforts, (m) major obstacles to implementation of the integration model within their child's school, and (n) any current concerns related to their child's educational placement. The survey also asked respondents to indicate their willingness to be contacted further by project staff to discuss their child's school program and how they might be reached.

The original parent survey was reviewed by a group of seven parents from North Carolina recruited by staff of the North Carolina *Learning Disabilities Association.* All reviewers were from suburban and urban locations and could be characterized as educated, middle-class subjects who were members of the *NCLDA* association.

The review session was held at the home of an *NCLDA* staff associate. All participants were instructed to read the letter of explanation, complete the survey, and remain for a short follow-up discussion. Reviewers were asked to look at the survey materials critically and to make recommendations for changes. They were reminded that some subjects in the research sample might have cultural and experiential backgrounds different from theirs, and to keep these issues in mind while reviewing the materials. To facilitate the review, a copy of the Parent Pretest Respondent Questionnaire was distributed and reviewers were asked to provide written and/or oral comments during the follow-up discussion (see Exhibit D). Oral responses were recorded by project staff.

Reviewers indicated that the OpScan format required some familiarity and suggested that this format be abandoned. They also suggested revisions to increase item clarity, eliminate specialized vocabulary, lower reading requirements, and enlarge print size. To accommodate these suggestions, the survey was re-designed and printed horizontally with larger type. Items were re-ordered to allow parents with children in schools not engaged in increased integration efforts to skip the last items, specific items were reworded to improve clarity, and alterations were made in some of the response choices. A statement regarding confidentiality was included on the survey instrument and cover letter in response to expressed concerns. The reviewers also suggested that a personal thank you be sent to each respondent. This suggestion was not implemented due to confidentiality, time, and resource constraints. Surveys materials were mailed to intermediaries to comply with confidentiality requirements. Parts I and II of the instrument were pre-coded to enable tracking of returned and unreturned surveys (see Exhibit E).

Structured Interview: School Personnel

To supplement data collected via the mail surveys, field visits to a random sample of school divisions were conducted during April - June, 1992. In an effort to maintain focus and consistency of interviews during these follow-up visits, a structured outline was developed to elicit *first-hand* reports of integration efforts from special and general education supervisors, building principals, general education teachers, and LD teachers. The interview outline included requests for information about:

- the specific school visited,
- how the integration efforts for students with learning disabilities began,
- goals for the integration efforts,
- preparatory and continuing staff development activities,
- indicators to be used to evaluate outcomes of the integration efforts,
- the impact of integration efforts on school resources,
- the overall impact of integration on school policies and procedures,
- initial and current staff reactions to the integration efforts,
- the nature and process of instructional planning in integrated classrooms,
- instruction in integrated classrooms,
- typical instructional accommodations in integrated classrooms,
- perceived adequacy of instructional accommodations in integrated classrooms,
- typical daily schedule for LD teachers,
- the availability of in-school "pull-out" services for LD students,
- obstacles encountered with integration efforts,
- the observed impact of integrated instruction on LD and non-disabled students,
- overall impressions of the integration model for LD students,
- unrealized goals for integration,
- anticipated next steps for the integration effort,
- actions taken that, in retrospect, would be different, and
- recommendations for replication elsewhere (see Exhibit F).

Within the time available, and based on item relevance for the various persons interviewed (e.g., descriptive information about the school typically was obtained from building principals), the above information was elicited via informal conversations with representatives of the target groups. Information obtained was recorded on the form by project staff during the interviews.

Structured Interview: Parents with Learning Disabled Children

To supplement data collected via the mail parent survey, interviews also were requested and scheduled with parents at schools participating in the follow-up field visits. Again, in an effort to maintain focus and consistency, a structured outline was developed to elicit *first-hand* reports of integration efforts from parents of students with specific learning disabilities (see Exhibit G). The interview included requests for information about:

- the nature of the child's learning disability and when it was first identified,
- the length of time special education services had been provided,
- the type of learning disability program their child was participating in during the 1991/92 school year,
- where special education services were provided,
- the amount of time spent with the learning disability teacher each week,
- classes that their child found easy and more difficult,
- their awareness of any attempts to increase the amount of time their child spent in the regular classroom,
- their awareness of any specific goals for increasing the amount of time students spend in the regular classroom and their involvement in planning,
- the extent and nature of any adaptations of in-school and homework assignments,
- their child's ability to complete his or her assignments within the regular classroom,
- their judgements regarding the adequacy of instructional support and adaptations,
  their extent of agreement with selected queries contained on the mail surveys,
- parents' overall views about school this year,
- feedback received about their child's performance this school year.
- personal observations regarding any outcomes related to increased time spent in the general classroom(s) this school year,
- expectations for school completion,
- awareness of their child's post-school plans,
- preference in educational placement,
- their evaluation regarding how realistic the 1991-92 year's integration efforts had been,
- factors considered important for judging the success of increased integration efforts,
- any personal impact of integration on them as a parent, and
- any comments and suggestions related to the integration model.

Within the time available, the above information was elicited via guided discussions with parents identified for interviews by the administrative staff of the schools visited. Project staff recorded responses and comments on the record sheet during the interviews.

Structured Interview: Students with Learning Disabilities

Using the overall research questions as a guide, a structured interview procedure was developed for students with specific learning disabilities in compliance with the previously identified instrument standards. The instrument requested information regarding:

- the schedule and location of instruction for the student's school day,
- the instructional staff engaged with the student across the school day,
- relative ease and difficulty of school subjects/classes,
- the student's ability to complete in-class and homework assignments on his or her own,
- any accommodations in in-class and homework assignments,
- the person(s) who usually provides help with homework,
- the student's perceptions of his or her school work compared to other classmates,
- the student's comfort when asking for teacher assistance,
- preferred location for extra help when needed,
- perceived adequacy of instructional assistance,
- perceptions of grades earned this academic year and perceptions on how teachers and parents feel about the earned grades,
  overall feeling about school,
- extent of personal comfort around other students when learning something new, completing a work assignment, and interacting in social situations,
- plans to complete high school, post-school plans, and any foreseen problems in achieving these plans,
- any suggestions regarding what teachers and schools could do to enhance the learning and school experience,
- perceptions regarding the extent of personal control over success at school, and
- any other comments about school.

The instrument included an introduction, a daily schedule chart, and 24 specific items. Ending remarks were included to thank the students for their assistance and to assure them that their responses would be treated in a confidential manner.

Prior to use, the instrument was reviewed informally by three individuals and, subsequently, school and parental permission was obtained to field-test the interview instrument. As part of the field test, five students in grades 4, 8 & 11 in three schools within two school divisions were interviewed and asked for comments related to the interview's content and procedure. To facilitate responses, individual cards noting frequently used response choices were made and displayed in front of the student as the related items were presented. Interviews were tape recorded in cases where student permission was granted, and notes were taken by the interviewer during the interviews.

Students were first told that the purpose of this project was to "find out how students with learning disabilities feel about school." They were asked to provide their school schedule for a typical day including names and duties of teacher present in the classroom. The five students assisting in the field test of the instrument commented and made recommendations. Their assistance was beneficial in eliminating high level vocabulary, confusing wording, and in improving the format and organization of the interview instrument. The average amount of time needed to complete the interview was approximately 16 minutes. The final interview instrument materials consisted of a cover letter to parents requesting permission to interview their child, a parent/student permission form, a subject information sheet and the student interview instrument. The actual instrument consisted of 27 queries with additional follow-up questions (see Exhibit H).

Structured Observations in Integrated Classrooms

To supplement interview data collected during the field visits and via mail surveys, project staff completed in-class observations of integration efforts underway within each school. Again, in an effort to maintain focus and consistency of observations across settings, a structured outline was developed to guide observations and to provide directions for observers (see Exhibit I).

Observers were instructed to inform the teacher(s) that they were not present to evaluate teaching and that copies of the observation notes would be made available to them for review, if desired. Teachers and observers also were asked to avoid any comments or behaviors that might direct attention to the student(s) with learning disabilities in the class. The observation outline had space for recording information about:

- the nature of the class being observed,
- the instructional focus of the lesson and any adaptations,
- instructional methods employed and individuals involved,
- instructional materials used,
- outcome monitoring procedures used and any adaptations,
- primary role(s) of instructional personnel,
- extent of task engagement exhibited by LD students,
- extent that LD students were able to complete successfully the in-class tasks,
- extent and nature of assistance sought and provided to LD student,
- any self-referent, peer, or teacher statements regarding LD students' behavior and performance,
- any observations related to peer acceptance,
- any relevant teacher comments, and
- other comments or observations.

Subjects and Subject Selection Procedures

Participants in Mail Surveys

Special Education Supervisors. All special education supervisors in Virginia's school divisions (n = 132) were sent the initial mail survey. Supervisors were asked to indicate the extent that their school division had undertaken efforts to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the general education program via the *integration* or *inclusion* model. Adjusting for the three systems sharing one supervisor, 100 (76%) of the 132 surveys were returned and used in the generation of overall group findings.

Supervisors' responses to survey items 1-3, indicating the extent of integration efforts within their school division at the elementary, middle, and senior high levels, were used to partition the groups for subsequent sampling into "integration activity" groups. Category I consisted of 14 systems wherein the supervisor reported *extensive* efforts to increase the amount of time students with learning disabilities spend in the general education program. Category II included 47 systems reporting *some* activity, and Category III included 8 systems reporting *no* such active efforts. Category IV included the remaining systems wherein supervisors had responded to these items in an ambiguous manner.

Other School Personnel. Using the "integration activity" categories described above, random samples of building principals (n = 180), elementary (n = 360) and secondary (n = 357) general education teachers, and LD teachers (n = 354) were generated from the State Personnel Data Tapes. Sampling limits were set to produce a substantially larger number of individuals from systems reporting *extensive* or *some* active efforts, in contrast to systems categorized as having *no* active integration efforts.

Sampling procedures were used to identify building principals at three instructional levels (elementary, middle, and secondary). The potential secondary teacher subject pool was limited to teachers with the following primary assignment codes: English 8 & 11, World History, Virginia History/US Government, Consumer Math, Algebra I, Earth Science, Biology, Introduction to Marketing, Building Trades I, and Home Economics. Elementary education teachers were drawn across grades 1-7, and LD teachers were pulled randomly across levels. A random sample of general education supervisors (n = 60) was selected from the *1991 Virginia Educational Directory*.

Tables 1 and 2 provide an overview of the professionals included in the G-Target mail surveys. Table 3 provides an overview of the surveys sent and calculated return rates. These rates include incomplete and/or unusable surveys returned. Additional descriptive information on each subject group is presented within the individual subsections of this report.

Parent Sample. The sample of parents asked to complete the mail survey included all parents of students with learning disabilities in one elementary school of a system categorized as having *extensive* efforts to increase the amount of time students with learning disabilities spend in the general education program (n = 17) *and* a systematic statewide sample of parents of children with specific learning disabilities who are members of the *Virginia Learning Disability Association* (n = 100). Specifications for selecting the *LDA* parent sample were provided to the organization's representatives to facilitate systematic sampling procedures (see Exhibit J). By the closing date of the project 29 (25%) completed surveys had been received with six returned due to an incorrect address or because the recipient did not have a child currently in school.

Participants in Follow-up Interviews

Interviews with School Personnel. In an effort to better understand the extent and nature of reported *integration/inclusion* efforts for students with specific learning disabilities, follow-up visits were made during April, May, and June to seven of sixteen randomly selected school divisions which had responded to a letter requesting visitation during this period. These visitations included five systems wherein the special education supervisor had reported *extensive* integration/inclusion efforts, and two that indicated their system was engaged to *some* extent in this initiative. (One system was ultimately reclassified as a *No Active Efforts* system based on field visit reports.) Exhibit K includes copies of the correspondence and other materials related to the visits. Interviews were held in the individual schools or, in some cases with supervisors, in the central administrative offices. An overview of the interview topics was furnished for prior distribution to participants along with a letter of explanation and the scheduled time for the interview. All persons participating in the interview were informed that their comments would be summarized but individual responses would not be shared with anyone beyond the project staff. Project staff followed written guidelines related to the completion of pre-visit, visit, and post-visit tasks (See Exhibit K). Packets containing courtesy copies of all visit-related forms were given to the contact person hosting the visit and building principals.

Although directions specified the position categories and the desired number of persons to be interviewed in the follow-up field visits, school personnel, students, and parents were selected by school division representatives and thus may be best characterized as convenience samples. During these visits, 131 interviews and 18 observations were conducted. Table 4 reports the number of persons interviewed by role assignment within each school division. Two schools were visited in the Bedford, Fairfax, Hanover, King William, and Smyth County Public School systems, and one school was visited in the Albemarle and Roanoke County School systems. Each school visit was scheduled across one day but one site required a follow-up visit in order to complete the observation. The number of persons interviewed within each system varied depending upon the number of schools visited within each system and the schedule prepared by the hosting school. (The Albemarle system visit was abbreviated due to end-of-school year activities.)

Parents. Fifteen parents were interviewed during the follow-up site visits within six of the seven systems visited using the previously described structured interview format. All parents were selected by personnel within the individual schools to participate in the interviews; thus, the results reported herein should be interpreted with an awareness of this selection constraint. Thirteen interviews were conducted with mothers of students with specific learning disabilities. A couple and a father also participated in the parent interview group. All interviews were conducted in a private location within the schools visited and lasted 30-45 minutes. Parents were assured that their views would not be reported individually.

Students with Learning Disabilities. Thirty-one students with specific learning disabilities were selected to participate in the scheduled interviews by the hosting school divisions. Nineteen of the students were receiving services in systems characterized by the special education supervisors as having *Extensive* integration efforts, four were from systems viewed as having *Some Active Efforts*, and eight were from a system that, from interview reports, might be best characterized as having *No Active Efforts* to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the general classroom setting beyond recent practice. Eighteen males and 13 females participated in the interviews including 6 African-Americans, 24 Caucasians and one Hispanic. Students were enrolled in grades 3-12. Their mean IQ, as measured by the most recently individually administered tests (i.e., Wechsler or Binet), was 91.4. Additional information characterizing the students interviewed is presented in Table 5.

Preliminary Achievement Outcomes

School personnel within systems visited were asked to provide information related to students' academic outcomes as measured by standardized achievement tests administered in Spring 1991 and Spring 1992. Numeric codes were used, except where written parental consent had been obtained granting access to this confidential information. To facilitate data collection, a form for recording needed information was provided. The most recent Full-Scale intelligence score from an individually administered test was requested and used as a co-variant to control for differences in intellectual abilities. Achievement scores were converted to a common metric for comparative analysis. Complete information was not provided in all cases resulting in a reduction in the number of subjects used in the analysis.

Assurance of Confidentiality/Anonymity

Throughout the project, all data requests provided respondents with an assurance of confidentiality and the guarantee that only personnel working on the project would have access to their individual responses. Postage-paid envelopes bearing the university's address were enclosed for direct return in conformance with this assurance.

Data Entry and Analysis Procedures

The 11 research questions were examined using descriptive and inferential statistics along with content analysis of responses to *open form* queries and other submitted materials. Scale values associated with the *Can't Judge* or *No Opinion* responses were excluded in calculating mean values. In statistical comparisons of group differences, Bonferonni's inequality (Mendenhall, Wackerly, and Scheaaffer; 1990), was invoked, *a priori*, to ensure an experimental-wise Type I error rate of 0.05. Critical values associated with this procedure are noted on the tables reporting statistical comparisons of respondent groups and related post hoc tables.

Data entry, analysis, and summary involved the following steps.

1. Development of a procedure for tracking and monitoring the number of surveys mailed and received on a weekly basis.
2. Generation of SAS and ASKSAM data files for all survey and interview data.
3. Generation of an ASKSAM database for *Open-form* responses and interview data.
4. Processing of OpScan forms to generate SAS data files.
5. Entry of quantifiable data from the student and parent interviews to generate SAS data files.
6. Generation of a SAS data base for student achievement and intelligence scores.
7. Generation of descriptive statistics for each group.
8. Comparison of group means (i.e., ANOVAS, ANCOVAS, with post hoc analysis), where appropriate.

9. Content analysis and summarization of *open-form* data from mail surveys, interviews, observations, field visits, and other submitted material.

10. Generation of respondent/subject information from the data files.

11. Preparation of tables displaying results and related exhibits.

12. Verification of results in table presentations.

Results

The following sections provide an overview of findings related to the 11 research questions. The presentation format includes a re-statement of each research question, the analysis procedure(s) employed, references to related tables and an overview of major findings related to the specific question. Tables and Exhibits follow the overall narrative report.

Research Question 1

To what extent do special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general education teachers, LD students, and parents of students with specific learning disabilities in Virginia report their school division is actively attempting to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in general classrooms beyond recent practice?

Mail surveys sent to the target groups included queries (i.e., Q1-Q3) related to the extent of integration efforts at the elementary, middle, and high school levels for students with specific learning disabilities. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had observed *Extensive (1)*, *Some (2)* or *No Active Efforts (3)* to increase the amount of time students with learning disabilities spend in the regular classroom setting. A *No Opinion* option was available. Tables 6 to 8 display results related to efforts at the three instructional levels as reported by the 788 educators who responded to the surveys.

Examining results across the three levels, 63-85% of the respondents reporting efforts to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular or general education classroom beyond current practice at the high school and middle school levels. Respondents reported the most extensive efforts occurring at the elementary school level (see Table 6) with 34.5% characterizing their school or school system's efforts as *Extensive* and 50.5% reported *Some Efforts* to increase the amount of time students with learning disabilities spend in the general education classroom. *Extensive Efforts* at the middle and high school levels were reported by 24.1% and 21.6%, respectively (see Tables 7 & 8). Approximately 47% of the respondents reported *Some Active Efforts* at the middle school level, and 41.4% reported similar efforts at the high school level. Substantially more of the respondents chose the *No Opinion* option or did not respond to Q2 (integration at middle school level) or Q3 (integration at the high school level).

A related query included on the mail survey sent to parents revealed that 34.6% of those responding judged their child's school as having *Extensive Efforts* to increase the amount of time their child spends in the general education program with an equal proportion reporting *Some Efforts* (see Table 87). Other findings from this group are presented later.

Research Question 2

To what extent do special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary *education teachers, and LD teachers in Virginia report that their system has adopted any guidelines, written philosophies, or policies designed specifically to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the general classroom?*

Mail surveys included a query to determine whether guidelines, written philosophies, and policies had been developed to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular classroom. Respondents were asked to indicate the presence of such documents by responding *Yes*, *No*, or *Can't Judge* and to submit copies of such documents. Table 9 displays frequencies and percentages associated with reports from respondents in the six groups.

Across groups, 301 (38.2%) of the 788 respondents reported policies designed to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular classroom. Thirty-two percent (n=252) stated that their school or school division had not adopted such guidelines, written philosophies, or policies, and a substantial portion of the respondents (208 or 26.4%) selected the *Can't Judge* option.

Special education supervisors overwhelmingly reported the absence of such specific adoptions (i.e., 82.5%), although almost half of the general elementary education teachers (50.6%), general education supervisors (47.4%), general secondary education teachers (47.1%), and building principals (43.4%) reported their existence. Fewer (34%) of the learning disabilities teachers reported the adoption of such facilitative policies or documents, and (42.3%) failed to affirm their presence.

Only a limited number of documents were submitted in response to the Part II request. Exhibit M presents a summary of documents submitted in response to this query.

Research Question 3

To what extent do special education supervisors report the following accountability/monitoring measures are available to document the educational outcomes of students with learning disabilities on a system-wide basis in Virginia's school divisions?

- standardized measures of academic achievement,
- absenteeism,
- grade retention,
- dropout rate(s),
- rate of diplomas granted,
- students' attitudes toward learning and school,
- grades for each grading period,
- students' satisfaction in school placement,
- social acceptance within the regular education settings,

and other relevant data including:

- parental satisfaction with the educational program provided for their child,
- number of referrals for special education services,
- the number of students with learning disabilities in each program delivery option each school year, and
- educational costs in the delivery of services for students with specific learning disabilities?

To determine what systems were in place that might be used to monitor the impact of increased integration initiatives, special education supervisors were asked to indicate whether specific outcomes data were being collected systematically and summarized on an individual school or school system basis for students with learning disabilities. Response choices were *Data Available for LD Students* (1), *Data Available -- Not by Category* (2), or *Data Unavailable* (3). A *Can't Judge* response option also was provided. Table 10 presents results from 100 (76%) supervisors of special education throughout the state who responded to this query. Mean values for outcome indices are presented in rank order based on their availability for students with learning disabilities.

Findings suggest limited data are available *specifically* for students with learning disabilities (e.g., grades, absenteeism, dropout rates, rate of diplomas granted, standardized measures of academic achievement, etc.), and several other important indicators are, for the most part, not readily available as part of overall special education outcome measures (e.g., students' social acceptance within the regular education setting, satisfaction in school placement, attitude toward learning and school, and parental satisfaction with their child's educational program). This reportedly limited availability of outcomes data by disability presents a significant barrier to internal and external efforts to evaluate outcomes related to any specific program changes such as increased integration efforts.

Research Question 4:

To what extent do special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general education teachers, LD teachers, and parents within Virginia's school systems that are actively attempting to implement the REI or *integration model to serve students with specific learning disabilities (and perhaps other disabilities) personally agree with the following statements?*

- The integration model reduces the stigma associated with learning disabilities.
- Equal or superior learning opportunities are available for students with specific learning disabilities when the *integrated model* is used.
- Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.
- Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.
- The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the *integration model.*
- Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.
- Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.
- Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.
- "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.
- Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities through use of the integration model.
- Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.
- School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
- Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
- External consultants and/or experts have recommended movement to an *integrated* model for students with specific learning disabilities.
- Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.

- The integration model results in a *genuine* sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.
- Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.

An identical set of items consisting of the 17 statements presented above was included on surveys sent to special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers, and LD teachers. An abbreviated set was included in the mail survey sent to parents and in the parent interviews. (Neither parent group was included in the subsequent analyses of variance to detect group differences reported herein.)

Respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their *personal agreement* with each statement by selecting among the following response choices: *Agree* (1), *Tend to Agree* (2), *Tend to Disagree* (3), and *Disagree* (4). A *No opinion* response option was provided.

Table 11 presents item means, standard deviations, and percentages for each response choice for the focal groups, excluding parents. Items appear in rank order based on mean values signaling agreement with each item. This composite index of the 788 educators' personal views suggests highest agreement (mean = 1.64) with the statement, *External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities (Q18)*. Second highest agreement corresponds with Q5, *The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities* (mean = 1.73). Lowest agreement was found for survey items: Q10, *Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers* (mean = 3.48), Q8, *Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model* (mean = 2.87), Q11, *Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities* (mean = 2.87), and Q13, *"Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good* (mean = 2.86). Over half (56.3) of all respondents tended to disagree or disagreed that general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for these students (Q12; mean = 2.68).

A substantial number (43.7%) expressed no opinion regarding the statement, *Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served throughout the integration model(Q19)*; however, 68.4% agreed or tended to agree that *Equal or superior learning opportunities are available for students with specific leaning disabilities when the integration model is used* (Q6). Here, only 3.3% expressed no opinion.

Tables 12 to 17 display means, standard deviations, and percentages related to the extent of personal agreement for each target group (i.e., special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers, and LD teachers). Within each group, statements corresponding with Q5-Q21 appear in rank order based on mean values associated with the levels of personal agreement with each item.

Across all groups, Q18 (*External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities*), and Q5 (*The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities*) were items having the lowest mean values signaling highest agreement. In terms of adequacy of general educators' skills needed to make needed adaptations, over half (50-69.3%) of those responding across the professional groups disagreed or tended to disagree that such skills were present. With regard to willingness of general educators to make accommodations for students with specific learning disabilities (Q12), LD teachers and special education supervisors were most skeptical with 71.5% and 66%; respectively, tending to disagree or disagreeing. Between 42-51% of the respondents within the remaining professional groups shared this view.

General elementary education teachers tended to disagree or disagreed most strongly that *"Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good* (Q13; mean = 3.13). Mean values for Q10, *Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers*, received the lowest indication of agreement across all groups (i.e., mean values > 3.22).

Table 18 provides a summary of corresponding items included on the mail survey sent to parents. Readers are cautioned that the indirect sampling procedures and modest return rate, to date, represent limitations to the findings reported herein. Overall mean values for the 13 items soliciting indications of agreement ranged from 2.05 to 3.76, with more than half within the *Tend to Disagree* or *Disagree* range. Respondents indicated strongest agreement (mean = 2.05) with Q16, *School administrators/ supervisors and/or experts have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities* as did parents who participated in the interviews. Least agreement corresponds with Q11, *Regular classroom teachers have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities* (mean = 3.62), and Q10, *Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers* (mean = 3.76). Parents also tended to disagree that local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities (Q17; mean = 3.08), and with Q12, *Regular classroom teachers are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities* (mean = 3.28).

Table 19 presents a summary of views expressed by parents who participated in the interviews for the personal agreement queries. Again, as in the mail survey, the statement generating highest personal agreement was Q15k, *School personnel have encouraged use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities* (mean = 1.36). Similarly, lowest agreement corresponded with items Q15d, *Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities* (mean = 3.07), and Q15c, *Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers*, (mean = 3.07).

Research Question 5

To what extent do special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general education teachers, and LD teachers within Virginia's school systems that are actively attempting to implement the REI or integration model to serve students with specific learning disabilities (and perhaps other disabilities) report the following factors or justifications as the basis for implementation of policy and programmatic changes within their school division?

- The integration model reduces the stigma associated with learning disabilities.
- Students with specific learning disabilities have equal or superior learning opportunities when the integration model is used.
- Educational costs are reduced through use of the integration model.

- The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.
- Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.
- Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.
- Regular/general educators are able to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.
- Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.
- "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.
- Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities through use of the integration model.
- Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.
- School administrators / supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
- Local parents have encouraged use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
- External consultants and/or experts have recommended movement to an *integrated* model for students with specific learning disabilities.
- Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.
- The integration model results in a *genuine* sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.
- Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.

The identical set of items used previously as Q5-21 to identify personal agreement with statements concerning integration was included on surveys sent to special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers, and LD teachers to determine their perceptions regarding the extent to which each factor served as the basis for any policy or programmatic changes to increase the extent of integration for students with learning disabilities. Individuals employed in systems involved in integration efforts were asked to rate each statement using the following response choices: *Agree* (1), *Tend to Agree* (2), *Tend to Disagree* (3), and *Disagree* (4). Again, a *No Opinion* option was available. Respondents not working in systems undertaking efforts to increase the amount of time students spend in the regular classroom were asked to skip to Part II of the survey.

Table 20 presents item means, standard deviations, and percentages for each response choice for the G-Target groups. Items appear in rank order based on the mean values, with lower values signaling the factors considered more influential. This composite index of the 788 educators' views suggests that the most influential factor has been encouragement from school administrators and/or supervisors (i.e., Q33, *School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities*; mean = 1.83). Q35 (*External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities*), was reported as being almost equally influential (mean = 1.84).

The items dealing with reduced educational costs (Q24; mean = 2.49), reductions in referrals and time consuming assessments through use of the integration model (Q26; mean = 2.92), and questions regarding the efficacy of "pull-out" programs (i.e., Q30; mean = 2.63), were reported as being among the least influential factors.

Tables 21-26 display results related to perceptions of influences stimulating programmatic change for each G-Target group. Within each group, statements corresponding with Q22-Q38 appear in rank order based on mean values associated with each item. Here again, lower mean values correspond with what respondents viewed as the more influential factors directing program change.

Special education supervisors and LD teachers saw Q33 (*School administrators / supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities*), as the factor having the most influence (i.e., mean values 1.52, 1.87; respectively). General education supervisors (mean = 1.63), general elementary education teachers (mean = 1.66), and general secondary education teachers (mean = 1.76) rated Q35, *External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities* as being most influential in increasing the integration efforts within their school or school division. Principals saw reducing the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities (Q22; mean = 1.78)) as the factor having the most influence on recent programmatic change.

Research Question 6

To what extent do special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general education teachers, LD teachers, and parents report the following factors, often associated with successful change efforts, have been present within schools attempting to implement an increased integration model?

- Involvement of key stakeholders (i.e., central administrators, supervisors, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementing integration efforts,
- Establishment of realistic goals for integration,

- Clear articulation of goals for integration,
- Flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual school due to the presence of the unique school characteristics,
- Access to necessary resources and support for integration,
- A systematic process for evaluating the process and outcome of the integration effort.

Respondents in systems engaged in active efforts to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the general classroom were asked to rate whether each of the above attributes was *Clearly Present* (1), *Present to Some Extent* (2), or *Not Present* (3). As before, a *Can't Judge* option was available. Table 27 presents overall item means, standard deviations, and percentages for each response choice for the professional groups. Items appear in rank order of mean values based on the perceived presence of each facilitative feature associated with successful programmatic change.

Although five of the six attributes (i.e., Q39, Q40, Q41, Q42, Q43) were reported as being *Clearly Present* or *Present to Some Extent* by the majority of respondents thus indicating their presence, less than 27% saw any of the six as being *Clearly Present*. The lowest item mean, signaling highest presence, was for Q39, *Involvement of key stakeholders (i.e., central administrators, supervisors, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementation of integration efforts* (mean = 1.82). Respondents saw Q44, *A systematic process for evaluating the process and outcomes of the integration effort*, as the least present attribute (mean = 2.27). Approximately one-third (32.1%) of the respondents indicated that such an evaluation process was not present and another 23.5% selected the *Can't Judge* response regarding the evaluation query.

Tables 28-33 display findings for each of the respondent groups. Principals, general elementary and secondary education teachers, and LD teachers expressed highest agreement regarding *Involvement of key stakeholders (i.e., central administrators, supervisors, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementing integration efforts* (Q39), where mean values ranged from 1.77-1.92. In contrast, special education supervisors did not confirm this view, rating Q39 lowest of the six supporting attributes with regard to presence along with Q40, *Establishment of realistic goals for integration.* This group saw Q44, *Clear articulation of goals for integration*, as the attribute most clearly present. General education supervisors rated Q42, *Flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual schools due to the presence of unique school characteristics*, highest of the six attributes (mean = 1.59).

Parents who participated in the mail survey were asked to indicate their views concerning the presence of the same set of attributes facilitating program change using identical response choices. Respondents with children in programs seeking to increase the level of integration for students with specific learning disabilities indicated that most of the attributes associated with Q38-44 were present to some extent (see Table 34). Q39, *Involvement of key stakeholders (i.e., central administrators, supervisors, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementation of integration efforts* was considered most present of the six attributes (mean = 1.93), with Q44, *A systematic process for evaluating the process and outcomes of the integration effort*, reported as the least present characteristic (2.33). Again, due to the limited number of respondents in systems responding to the integration initiative, these results should be viewed as preliminary.

Research Question 7

What are the academic outcomes (i.e., basic skills as measured by standardized assessment procedures) for a preliminary sample of students with specific learning disabilities for the 1991-92 academic year in Virginia school divisions that have and have not adopted and implemented the REI or integrated service delivery model?

To obtain a preliminary view of outcomes, numerically coded standard scores from individual standardized achievement tests administered during the Spring of 1991 and 1992 and the most recent individually administered intelligence test scores were requested from three school divisions participating in the follow-up field visits. Two of the systems characterized by the special education supervisors as actively attempting to increase the amount of time students spend in the regular education program and one that had judged their current program as being most appropriate submitted student test scores in response to the data request. Where available, scores for students participating in the student interviews were added to the data set. Mixed reporting of standard or grade equivalent scores and the use of various individual achievements tests necessitated that the provided math and reading achievement data be converted to *z* scores in order to examine academic gains. Wechsler Full-Scale intelligence scores (and one Binet score) were used as co-variant values to control for differences in students' intellectual abilities.

Table 35 presents findings for students partitioned into two activity groups: (1) students in schools characterized as having *Extensive* or *Some Efforts* to increase the amount of time students with learning disabilities spend in the general classroom, and (2) those from a system indicating *No Active* efforts to increase the amount of time spent in the general education program beyond current practice. No significant group differences were found for reading or math performance gains across the one-year period. However, due to the inconsistency of case selection and the limited sample size in the *Extensive* and *Some Active* groups and the use of students from one system characterized as *No Active Efforts*, these findings should be considered *strictly* as a very preliminary look at academic outcomes over a one-year period.

Research Question 8

What changes have general education supervisors, building principals, general education teachers, LD teachers, and parents of students with learning disabilities observed regarding the following outcome measures for students with specific learning disabilities that are attributed to the school or school division's integration efforts during the 1991-92 school year related to:

- LD students' standardized measures of academic achievement,
- LD students' grades for each grading period,
- LD students' attitudes toward learning and school,
- LD students' satisfaction in school placement,
- LD students' social acceptance within the regular education setting,
- parental satisfaction with the educational program provided for their child with a learning disability,
- absenteeism for LD students,
- anticipated grade promotion rate for LD students,
- dropout rate for LD students,
- anticipated rate of diplomas granted to LD students,

and other anticipated outcomes including:

- number of referrals for special education services,
- availability of appropriate educational services for students with learning disabilities,

- cost efficiency in the delivery of services for students with learning disabilities?

Respondents reporting increased integration efforts within their school or school division were asked to indicate whether they had observed a *Positive Change* (1), *No Change* (2), *Negative Change*(3), or *Can't Judge* (4) regarding 13 outcome indicators appearing as Q45-Q57 on the survey instruments sent to the G-Target groups. (Individuals reporting no active integration efforts in their school or school system were were asked to skip these items and continue with Part II of the survey.) Table 36 presents composite item means, standard deviations, and percentages for each response choice for the composite group with items arranged in rank order based on reports of positive change.

Across groups, the most positive changes reported related to: Q50 (*Parental satisfaction with the educational program provided for their child with a learning disability*; mean = 1.40), Q47 (*LD students' attitude toward learning and school* (mean = 1.41), Q48 (*LD students' satisfaction in school placement* (mean 1.42), and Q49 (*LD students' social acceptance within the regular education setting*; mean = 1.43). Less than 10% of the respondents reported negative changes across items; however, a substantial percentage (i.e., > 27.5%) chose the *Can't Judge* response.

Tables 37-41 provide findings for each group; again with items arranged in order of means for observed positive change. Across groups, a substantial proportion of respondents (i.e., 18-83%), selected the *Can't Judge* response. For those respondents who did express a view, mean values ranged from 1.11 to 2.00 signaling positive change to no change. The number of referrals for special education services (Q55) received the lowest indication of change across four of the five groups, and cost efficiency (Q57) was viewed as the least observed change by general secondary teachers.

Parents participating in the mail survey and who had children in programs seeking to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the general classroom were asked to indicate what, if any changes they have observed in their child during the 1991-92 school year. Each was asked to consider ten change measures similar to those considered by educators and to indicate whether they have observed *Positive Change*, *No Change*, or *Negative Change*. At the close of the project, the number of returned surveys was low and those who had experience with the integration model was limited. Thus, the results must be considered as very preliminary.

None of the mean values exceeded 2.0 which would have indicated a negative change; however, three indicators (i.e., Q27, Q28, & Q31) had mean values of 2.0 which reflects no change (see Table 42). Inspection of the frequencies associated with each item suggest that views do differ across the parent group with equal percentages seeing positive and negative changes for some indicators (e.g., Q26, *Standardized test measures of your child's academic achievement*, Q27, *Your child's grades for each grading period*, Q28, *Your child's attitude toward learning and school*, and for Q31, *Your satisfaction with the education program provided for your child*. This may reflect differences related to the nature and development of schools' integration efforts, the diversity of students' needs, or parents' expectations and preferences regarding educational services.

Nine similar queries were included in the structured interviews conducted with parents during the follow-up visits to determine what, if any, changes they had observed in their own child over the 1991-92 school year. Table 43 provides a summary of related findings based on 15 parents' reports. The most positive changes noted correspond with Q19g (*Child's prospects for promotion this year*; mean = 1.40), Q19c (*Child's attitude toward learning and school*; mean = 1.42), and Q19b (*Grades for each grading period*; mean = 1.46). The change indicator rated lowest was Q19a (*Standardized test measures of academic achievement*; mean = 2.56). Here, 33% of the parents selected the *Can't Judge* option, and 55.6% reported no observed change. Again, due to non-random parent selection procedures and the small number interviewed, these represent pilot study findings.

Research Question 9

What do students with learning disabilities report regarding the nature of their intervention program, their feelings of social acceptance, comfort, and success, their preferences related to where special support is provided, future plans, and suggestions for program improvement?

During the field visits, 31 students (grades 3-12) were interviewed using the previously described structured interview format. The group consisted of 18 males and 13 females with a mean age of 14.6. Six of the students were African-Americans (19.4%), 24 were Caucasians (77.4%), and one was Hispanic (3.2%). All students had been identified as having a learning disability by 7th grade and four had secondary disabilities. The group's overall intelligence, based on the most recently reported individual test results, was 90.8. Overall and integration group frequencies and means for quantitative results are reported in Table 44.

Nineteen (61.3%) of the students reported they usually received help with the rest of their class (Q7). Forty-two percent expressed no preference regarding where they received help when needed (Q8); however, 32% preferred to receive assistance in a separate classroom, and 26% preferred to receive help in their general education classroom with other students. In terms of rating the sufficiency of help received (Q9), 41.9% indicated that they received the help they needed "all of the time," 29% said "most of the time," and 22.6% responded "some of the time."

Questions 13-15 asked students to indicate how they felt about their grades earned during the current school year and how they believed their parents and teachers would respond if asked the same question. Over two-thirds (67.7%) indicated that they felt good about their grades (Q13), with 12.9% selecting "very good" and 19.4% choosing the "needs improvement" options. About 39% believe their teachers would say their grades were "good" with 19% selecting the "very good" and "needs improvement" options. A similar pattern corresponds with their beliefs concerning their parents' views regarding grades where 26% of the students thought their parents view their grades as "very good" and 29% selected "needs improvement."

Q17a-17c asked students about their comfort with peers when: a) learning something new, b) completing a work assignment, and c) in social situations. Across these items, from 65-71% of those interviewed stated that they felt comfortable in such situations "all of the time" with greatest comfort associated with social situations.

Almost all of the students (93.5%) indicated plans to complete high school (Q18) and most (87.1%) had thought about what they would like to do following school (Q19). Twenty-six percent thought they might have problems achieving their plans (Q20). Responding to the query related to personal control over their success at school (Q23), 68% thought they had "total" or "some" control.

Approximately 10% felt they had little control, and 22.6% didn't know. Table 45 presents elaborative comments from the students' responses.

Research Question 10

What are considered to be: (a) the primary motivating factors for increased integration efforts, (b) primary reasons for not seeking to implement the integration model, and (c) obstacles cited by special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general education teachers, LD teachers, and parents of students with specific learning disabilities within systems that have and have not sought to implement an integrated model to serve students with specific learning disabilities (and perhaps other disabilities)?

Part II of surveys sent to each of the target groups requested additional information regarding what respondents viewed as:

1. *primary* or *basic reason(s)* for efforts to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular classroom within schools or school divisions that were actively seeking to implement the integration model to serve student with specific learning disabilities,
2. *primary reason(s)* for not seeking to implement the integration model if the respondent's school/school division was not involved in this initiative, and
3. *major obstacle(s)* to implementation of the integration model for serving students with specific learning disabilities within the respondent's school or school division.

Recorded responses to the Part II questions were used to create an ASKSAM data base which facilitated content analysis of views expressed for each respondent group. Tables 46-48 provide an overview of information regarding the responses offered by individuals responding to the Part II queries.

In terms of the basis for such initiatives, across target groups, instructional reasons (e.g., provides the least restrictive environment for students, to better meet needs of students) were among the most frequently cited response (i.e., 31.5%) followed by administrative/resource reasons (e.g., more effective use of special educational personnel and lower costs/funding constraints; 24.6%). Attitude (e.g., non-supportive attitudes of regular teachers, resistance, lack of interest; 24.7%), and administrative/resource barriers (e.g., inadequate funds or time constraints and insufficient personnel, 23.4%) accounted for the largest portion of obstacles cited, followed by instructional barriers (21.2%). Roughly half (49.8%) of the 233 responses given for no active integration efforts could be classified as administrative reasons (e.g., requires additional knowledge and inservice training, inadequate funds).

Tables 49-54 present summaries of categorical responses related to reasons for increased integration efforts. Tables 55-60 summarize reported obstacles to increased integration efforts, and Tables 61-66 identify reasons for a lack of such efforts for each target group. (Tables 88-91 present findings from the parent mail survey.) Collectively, these comments may prove instructive to those involved in or considering increased integration initiatives.

Research Question 11

What, if any, differences exist for common survey items across target groups and integration levels?

Analyses of variance were conducted to identify personnel group differences regarding: 1) personal agreement with 17 statements appearing as Q5-21 on surveys sent to special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers, and LD teachers, 2) opinions concerning the extent that factors expressed in the same 17 statements were viewed as the basis for increased use of the integration model for serving students with specific learning disabilities (i.e., Q22-38), and 3) perceptions related to the presence of six attributes to support integration efforts (i.e., Q39-44). Group differences related to perceptions of observed changes attributed to increased integration efforts for academic year 1991-92 (i.e., Q45-57) also were examined for the same groups, excluding special education supervisors who had responded to a differently structured item. Subsequently, this procedure was repeated with groups defined by level of integration efforts. In each case, Bonferroni's inequality was used to control the Type I error rate at 0.05 across the analyses of variance and in each of the post hoc comparisons.

Personnel Group Differences. Tables 67 to 70 report findings from the one-way analyses of variance for Q5-57 for the target personnel groups. Means and standard deviations for significant ANOVAS are presented in Tables 71-72. Across the various respondent groups (i.e., supervisors of special education, general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers, and LD teachers), significant group differences were found for: 1) Q5, Q6, Q9, Q11-13, Q15-16, and Q20-21 related to the personal agreement queries, 2) Q22-24 related to influencing factors in integration efforts, 3) and Q56 concerning changes observed that are attributed to increased integration efforts. Tables 73-75 identify the nature of group differences detected through post hoc analyses. The pattern displayed for Q5 reveals significantly stronger agreement for central office supervisory personnel as compared to general elementary and secondary education teachers regarding stigma reduction through use of an integration model, and a more positive view for the building principals as compared with general elementary education teachers. Building principals, however, are significantly less positive in their agreement than general education supervisors. Teachers and administrative / supervisory personnel also differ with regard to Q6, *Equal or superior learning opportunities are available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used*, with the former groups, again, being significantly less positive. Apart from principals, this pattern of administrators being more positive than teachers is repeated for Q9, *The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) though use of the integration model* and Q11, *Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities*, and for Q20, *The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.* With regard to the willingness of regular educators to make needed adaptations (Q12), LD teachers report significantly less agreement than do building principals, general education supervisors, and general elementary and secondary education teachers.

Group Differences By Integration Efforts. To examine the extent of differences in personal views expressed by respondents related to their own involvement with increased integration efforts, survey responses were partitioned into integration activity levels using Q1-3. Tables 76-78 show results related to this partitioning for the three instructional levels (i.e., elementary, middle, and high school). Significant differences were found for: Q12, Q16-17 & Q18 at the elementary level, Q12 & Q16 at the middle school level, and Q16 at the high school level. Tables 79-81 report means and standard deviations for items Q5-57 with Tables 82-84 displaying means and standard deviation values for significant ANOVAS. Results of post hoc analysis to determine the nature of these differences across the three instructional levels is displayed in Table 85.

At the elementary and middle school levels, respondents in the *No Active Efforts* group were in significantly less agreement that *Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities* (Q12), than were those individuals in groups reporting *Some* or *Extensive* efforts to increase the level of integration for students with specific learning disabilities. This same pattern is seen at the elementary level for Q17, *Local parents support use of the integration model for student with specific learning disabilities.* As might be expected, personal agreement differences also are evident for Q16, *School administrators / supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities* for the three groups. At the elementary and middle school levels, respondents in systems with extensive efforts expressed stronger agreement than those working in schools or systems with some active efforts. The active effort respondents, in turn, expressed more agreement than those in schools or systems with no active efforts to increase the level of integration. At the high school level, the views of those reporting extensive efforts were more positive than those in both the *Some Efforts* and *No Active Efforts* groups. No differences were found for the latter two groups for Q16.

Supplemental Findings from Follow-up Field Visits

Interviews with School Personnel. During the follow-up visits, 86 members of the schools' educational staff were interviewed and 18 *in-class* observations were conducted. These visits helped project staff to identify, *first-hand*, the unique qualities of integration efforts within each setting. A brief summary of findings gleaned from interview records is included as Exhibit M using a case format. These findings are supplemented by Exhibit N which provides an overview of the observations conducted.

Inspection of these case reports indicates that each system and/or school has approached the task of increasing integration or inclusion efforts for students with specific learning disabilities in somewhat different ways and with varying levels of goal specification, school/community preparations, resource allocations, and success. The programs visited range from what might be characterized as full-time inclusion efforts to initiatives to reduce *out-of-home-school* or *center-based* placements for students with specific learning disabilities (and, generally, students with other disabilities as well). Representatives of one system visited reported no inclination to "jump on the bandwagon" in view of their satisfaction with the current program. This system, therefore, was categorized as a *No Active Effort to Increase Integration* system.

Recurring views expressed during all visits were that such program change efforts required more staff preparation, common planning time, and more time for problem-solving. Clear communication of program goals and well-defined role expectations were cited as a critical and sometimes missing attributes.

School personnel interviewed cited a variety of program strengths for their increased integration efforts such as increased self-esteem for students with learning disabilities, opportunities for more socialization with peers, an increased sense of community in the school, benefits to all students, increased opportunities for teachers to work together, and better preparation of students for real-life situations. Weaknesses mentioned were the need for more collaborative planning, insufficient staff support and staff development, scheduling problems, large class size, lack of clarity regarding individual roles, and staff resistance.

Those interviews offered a number of specific recommendations for other systems seeking replication. These include:

1. Have the commitment of system/school leaders.
2. Provide necessary fiscal support.
3. Plan carefully before making any changes.
4. Visit and observe other programs engaged in such initiatives.
5. Consider the instructional needs of students as the foremost concern and avoid being drawn into a compromised position from outside forces (e.g., state and federal directives).
6. Talk to people to "pave the way." Move slowly and work together.
7. Provide students and parents with information about the changes being considered and seek their involvement in program development.
8. Emphasize the need for open communication.
9. Provide sufficient time for staff development.
10. Be realistic; recognize staff/system limitations.
11. Avoid student/teacher mis-matches. Begin with teachers who are willing and cooperative.
12. Develop a research-based model.
13. Be flexible. View the initiative as an evolving model.
14. Maintain a continuum of service options.

Supplemental Findings From Parent Groups

From Parent Interviews. Fifteen parents were interviewed during the follow-up visits. A summary of selected findings related to the structured interviews appears in Table 86. All of the parents' children had been identified as having a learning disability by the 4th grade with seven of the fifteen identified before second grade. Two-thirds of the parents were aware of increased integration efforts although over half were unaware of the goals for this program or had no response. Five of the parents indicated some form of resource services were currently being provided, three characterized their child's placement as being with the LD teacher most of the day, three were unclear of their child's specific placement, two reported their child was in an LD class for a substantial portion of the day, and two reported full inclusion in the regular classroom. Individuals selected to participate in the interviews were, for the most part, supportive of their child's educational program and believed that it was responding to his or her educational needs. Only one parent did not believe her child was receiving the educational support needed to be successful.

From Parent Participating in the Mail Survey. Results related to parents' responses to survey items included on instruments sent to educators have been integrated in earlier sections. Responses to unique items may be seen in Table 87. Approximately 70% of the parents reported *Extensive* or *Some* efforts to increase the amount of time their child spends in the regular classroom (see Q6). However, of those responding, almost half preferred half-day or more placement in a separate learning disabilities classroom or what appeared to be their child's current placement option (see Q7). As a group, 39.3% of the parents reported that their child's *in-school* assignments were being adjusted *Almost Always* but 42% said

Sometimes. A substantial portion (39.3%) said their child *Seldom* or *Never* was able to complete homework assignments alone. When help was needed, mothers were most often asked to help. Looking to the future, only 18.5% of those responding believed their child would be well-prepared for independent living and employment given his or her learning disabilities and the educational program being provided.

Tables 88-91 provide a summary of parents' views regarding reasons for increased integration efforts or a lack thereof, obstacle to overcome, and concerns. Of the 19 parents who completed Part II and who had children in programs seeking increased integration, the most often cited reason for such efforts was to reduce special education spending, although almost an equal number attributed program change to seeking ways to provide a better program and offering students with learning disabilities a chance to be in the mainstream environment. The major obstacles to increased integration were seen as insufficient preparation of staff and overcrowded general education classrooms. Although many of the expressed concerns were of a unique nature, the leading concern was wondering whether their child was really getting a good education or would fall through the cracks.

Discussion

Findings presented in this study clearly document active efforts to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the general classroom setting throughout Virginia with more efforts reported at the elementary school level. Foremost factors influencing these initiatives appear to be recommendations from external consultants and experts, encouragement of administrators and supervisors, the anticipation of less social stigma, and a belief that research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with learning disabilities served in integrated settings.

Respondents in the present study indicated that these heightened integration efforts are occurring apart from any formally adopted guidelines, written philosophies, or policies designed specifically to promote such initiatives in many settings. Compared to the other respondent groups, special education supervisors (the group that should be most knowledgeable about such changes), overwhelmingly report no such adoptions. The basis for their disparate views is unclear.

One explanation may come from respondents' composite view indicating that external forces are driving this initiative. If this is the case, perhaps such guiding documents have yet to be developed within some systems. Alternatively, supportive actions and or documents may be originating from non-special education sources within the systems. This, however, seems unlikely given special education supervisors' reports that school administrators and supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities. Most likely, they would view themselves as members of this group.

Although a lack of written documentation may reflect the speed of changes, diversity in the models being employed, or perhaps a reluctance to articulate positions that might be challenged as a departure from the provision of a full continuum of service options, it is somewhat difficult to envision how such program changes can be well-understood, or ultimately evaluated by the various *stakeholders*, without such guiding statements. Whatever the case, such reports signal quite different views regarding any formal actions being undertaken within systems to support reported program change.

Given the strong validation of increased integration efforts, a means for tracking the impact of such changes on students who serve as the "products" of these initiatives becomes a critical need. However, relying on the accuracy of special education supervisors' reports and information derived in the follow-up field visits regarding current outcome monitoring practices, it appears that data collection and summarization procedures will need to be modified and supplemented in order to evaluate the impact of this and any other program changes, where disability-specific information is desired. For example, *REI* proponents have forecasted successful academic outcomes, broad-spread benefits to all students, and greater cost efficiency among other positive outcomes. Yet, results from the surveys sent to special education supervisors reveal that outcome indicators such as standardized measures of LD students' academic achievement, absenteeism, grade retention, etc., although often maintained across special education categories, are unavailable to test some of the predictions of the *REI* initiative in most school divisions. The desire for such data, and the need to undergird new program initiatives with a strong evaluation plan is a pressing need and one recognized by professionals in several systems participating in the follow-up visits.

Although respondents express agreement with many aspects of integration and report positive outcomes, participants also expressed some doubt regarding the adequacy of general education teachers' skills for making needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities. Across professional groups, mean values for this item extended toward the range associated with the response, *Tend to Disagree*. These results are consistent with Semmel, Abernathy Butera, and Lesar's 1991 findings regarding teachers' sense of preparedness to meet the instructional needs of mildly handicapped students in the regular classroom. Semmel et al.'s Q13, (*Regular class teachers cannot meet the academic needs of mildly handicapped students currently in their classroom*), and Q16, (*My teacher training prepared me to effectively teach mildly handicapped students*), correspond with Q11, *Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for student with specific learning disabilities* in the current study. In both studies, these items were among the lowest in terms of personal agreement.

Previously Zigmond, Levin, and Laurie (1985) reported that 65% of general secondary education teachers considered students with learning disabilities different from other students in their classes. This perspective was strongly re-affirmed across all groups in the current investigation (see Table 11). Such a view would seemingly reinforce the need to provide learning environments that can respond to the individual needs of students with learning disabilities. Yet, present findings indicate that such accommodations may not always be forthcoming. More than half (56.3%) of the educators participating in this study *tended to disagree* or *disagreed* that general education teachers are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with learning disabilities (a requirement seemingly fundamental to a successful program change effort). This, coupled with the view that general education teachers lack necessary skills for making such adaptations, clearly is reason for genuine concern. The legitimacy of such concerns is heightened by Davis and Mahcady's report that only 32% of the general educators responding to their mail survey supported the goal to "educate special learners in general education classrooms." This, they note, is "the cornerstone of the *REI* movement" (1991, page 216). These disconcerting findings are further supported by Baker and Zigmond (1990) who found little direct evidence from classroom observations and interviews conducted in one elementary school to indicate that such accommodations actually were being made.

The task is, indeed, a difficult one. Substantial efforts will seemingly be needed to provide the assistance general educators seek with increased integration, to help them acquire skills for making adaptations, and to monitor the suitability of learning environments provided for students with specific learning disabilities.

Consistent with the investigation conducted by Coates (1989), professionals in the present study do not reject the efficacy of "pull-out" programs. Among the lowest expressions of agreement was Q13, *"Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good* in this study. This corresponds to Q2, *Resource rooms are not an effective model for meeting the needs of mildly* *handicapped students*, in the research conducted by Coates. (Elsewhere, Semmel et al. (1991) reported that regular and special education teachers expressed low agreement with similar queries addressing academic achievement outcomes, although their study focused on the mildly handicapped in a generic manner.)

It is quite possible that teachers' perceptions of skill inadequacies may be influencing their views regarding the efficacy of "pull-out" models as may the realities of general education classrooms. Whatever the case, there appears to be a need to listen more closely to teachers' views and to address their concerns as changes are proposed and implemented. Here, it also is important to recognize and consider differences in views held by general classroom teachers and those employed in administrative or supervisory positions as evidences in the findings reported herein. Similar results have been reported by Garvar-Pinhas and Schmelkin (1989) who found significant differences in views being expressed by elementary school principals, special education administrators, classroom teachers, and special education teachers and the least positive views toward mainstreaming expressed by classroom teachers. These authors point to previous studies which indicate that individuals more removed from the mainstreaming process are more positive; a pattern that seems to hold true in this study.

Classroom realities also may explain these disparate professional views. Although, conceptually, integration should result in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities, apart from a *bonafied* co-teaching model (see Bauwens, Hourcade, & Friend, 1989), much of the burden for making integrated classrooms responsive to students' special needs appears to be falling on general education teachers. In the present study, teachers identify many obstacles (e.g., difficulty meeting all students' needs, insufficient time to plan with special education personnel, insufficient access to the LD teacher who is expected or needed in more than one place at a time) that must be surmounted if such programs are to prove successful Again, a shared view of the impact of such obstacles may not always exist. For instance, in contrast to central supervisors, teachers in the present study expressed less agreement that utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved via increased integration. In times of tight budgets and pressing needs, the hope for better staff utilization is an enticing promise and stimulus for change; however, this claim needs validation.

Teachers, as compared to supervisors and administrators, also expressed lower agreement, that *genuine* sharing of instructional responsibilities will result from increased integration efforts. And, although the overall group of educators in the present study *tended to agree* that equal or superior learning opportunities are available for students with specific learning disabilities served in the integration model (Q5), general education and learning disabilities teachers expressed lower agreement than did administrators and supervisors.

In contrast to previous studies, respondents in the present study held different views regarding the impact of integration on the stigma associated with their disability. Semmel and his colleagues (1991) reported low personal agreement for items relating to stigmatization from "pull-out" programs, while educators in this study expressed second-highest agreement with Q5, *The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities*. In the present study, both survey results and interview findings clearly indicate that respondents see reduced stigma as an anticipated outcomes which has served as a driving force in recent integration initiatives. Professionals also report that students exhibited positive change in this area during the 1991-92 school year. Among parents, views were mixed.

Clearly, reduced stigmatization is fundamental to proponents' case and a strong incentive for program change. Yet, Bear, Clever and Proctor (1991) reported findings indicating that integration "is unlikely to have a positive effect on self-perceptions of children with learning disabilities" (page 409). Similar results also were reported by Beltempo and Achille (1990), who determined that although maximum placement in special education settings (i.e., over 70% of the school day) resulted in low self-concepts that persist over time, no placement also resulted in similar low self-concepts. Students seemed to benefit most when they are served early using a combination of partial "pull-out" and integrated services. These studies challenge the view that improved self-concept is a given outcome of the integration model and, specifically, the reports of educators participating in the present study. Most likely, outcomes related to diminished stigma or improved self-concept are a function of the specific integration model employed along with many other factors.

Some insights come from the views expressed by students participating in the interviews conducted. A substantial number (44%) of students enrolled in systems seeking to increase integration said they would prefer to receive extra help in a separate classroom with other students who need assistance. Approximately 26% also reported that they received the help they needed in school only *Some of the Time* or *Never*. More information is needed to discover the basis for these views, how they interact with the severity of students' disabilities, and the nature of adaptations and support being provided. Walsh (1991) determined that secondary special education students (and their parents, and teachers participating in voluntary co-teaching classes) felt better about themselves in a co-taught class and had more friends. However, many factors influence where and from whom students would prefer to receive help including their current placement, grade level, perceptions of who could be most helpful, the quality of the learning environment, etc. (Jenkins and Heinen, 1989). Avoiding embarrassment was found to be a major consideration in students' preferences. Jenkins and Heinen concluded that "these results challenge the notion that children generally prefer to have specialists come to them rather than go to the specialists...(and that)... students need to be consulted about their preferences because it is hazardous to assume that children necessarily 'see it our way'" (pp. 519 & 523).

Clearly, students' views should be solicited and, based on experiences in the current study, they are most willing to talk about their school experiences. Efforts to gain access to their views should be an integral part of any program planning, implementation, or evaluation process. Additional efforts to document actual outcomes using multi-faceted indicators over an extended period of time are critical and missing elements in our current research base. Such data are essential for addressing the basic question of program efficacy in a more systematic and comprehensive manner. To answer some of our most critical questions will require well-designed studies that control or minimize the Hawthorn effect.

Conclusion

Current efforts to increase integration, do not occur without risk. Our risk-tolerance is extended when there is sufficient evidence to forecast long-term gains. Yet, greater risk is taken when any organization allows external consultants to cause changes which, to be successful, must be compatible with the system's needs, accepted by key *stakeholders*, and, ultimately, implemented from within. Clearly, stimulating ideas, whatever their origin, are needed within any enterprise and they often are the seeds of growth or revitalization. But *best-fit*, thorough preparation, and *optimal staging* of the desired change deserve careful consideration. This is a basic theme of the *site-based management* movement and where accountability must ultimately be demonstrated.

Risk also comes from accepting, as fact, representations that a sufficient research base currently exists to justify what some have characterized as another pendulum swing (Davis, 1989) in the delivery of special education services. Systematic searches of the literature reveal a plethora of conceptual or opinion articles on *REI* but only recently are data-based studies being reported that relate specifically to outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities (e.g., Affleck, Madge, Adams, & Lowenbraun, 1988; Bear, Clever, & Proctor, 1991; Cooper & Speece, 1990; Noweeck, McKinney, & Hallahan, 1990; Schulte, Osborne, & McKinney, 1990; Zigmond & Baker, 1990). There also are conflicting findings. Perhaps professionals views are being strongly influenced by the many opinion articles and presentations and/or the overall emphasis on educational reform. However, desiring or forecasting certain program outcomes and documenting achievement of such outcomes represent two different circumstances. Anderegg and Vergason (1987, pages 16-18) remind us that the research conducted by Margaret Wang (which has heavily influenced the *REI* initiative), *did not* focus on children with handicapping conditions and that the children involved in her studies were, for the most part, first and second graders. Fuchs and Fuchs (1988) signal other cautions regarding limitations of these often cited foundation studies.

Taken together, these cautions do not to suggest that programs improvements efforts should be avoided but point to our need to minimize unacceptable risks as we seek new designs for program enhancement. Although focused on what is happening in one state, the findings reported herein provide a *snapshot* of the nature and extent of changes that have occurred to date, forces influencing programmatic changes to achieve increased integration (or lack thereof), perceived and actual outcomes, and obstacles confronting implementation of this model. With such uncertainty and the findings from this study, careful development and monitoring of pilot programs may prove to be a prudent strategic decision. The suggestions from school systems reported earlier may prove to be noteworthy guides to others involved in increased integration efforts.

The admonitions of Martin (1987), Gartner & Lipsky (1989), and Keogh (1990) calling for conservative actions, systematic evaluation of change efforts, and scrutiny of students' outcomes demand our attention as we undertake "mold-breaking" program changes. Clearly the train called *reform* has left the station. Its *payload* represents a generation of learners. Educators serving as engineers must make certain that well-designed initiatives, multi-faceted evaluation plans, and critical outcomes data are available to guide this uncharted journey.

Project Evaluation

The standards listed below were proposed as criteria for judging the success of this project. Internal judgements based on the principal investigator's observations are included.

1. *The extent to which the timeline and tasks were realistically planned.* Although the initial timeline appeared workable, late notification of the grant award resulted in a heavy workload in order to respond to constraints of the public school year calendar.
2. *Clarity of data collection instruments and related correspondence.* Pilot groups were asked to review the survey materials and, as a result, offered many helpful suggestions to increase clarity.
3. *The technical adequacy of developed data collection instruments (To be evaluated by personnel in the University's Office of Measurement and Research Services).* The prototype instrument, which subsequently was adapted for use with the other groups, was reviewed by the Director of the University's Office of Measurement and Research Services on two occasions. His suggestions helped to improve the structure and form of the survey instruments.

4. *The degree of success in obtaining representative samples and and satisfactory return rates for various target groups and other needed data.* Sampling procedures used are judged as acceptable. Table 3 provides an accounting of individuals interviewed. Table 4 provides information on return rates which ranged from a high of 76% for supervisors of special education to a low of 25% for the mail parent survey. Among the professional groups, general secondary education teachers had the lowest return rate (i.e., 46%). Across all phases of the project, 954 individuals contributed to the data bases excluding the unusable or incomplete responses.

5. *The extent that the analyses of data provide a reasonably clear answer to the research questions (To be evaluated by the primary investigator, sponsor, and other readers of the report/study).* Obtaining data to address Research Question 7 related to student outcomes proved to be the most tedious facet of the data collection efforts. Because direct access to students with specific learning disabilities and their parents is prohibited due to confidentiality requirements, the samples used in this study were samples of convenience. Due to this fact, and limited sample size, associated results should be viewed as findings from a pilot study. Beyond these limitations and the low return on the parent survey, the principal investigator considers the findings reported herein to be valid.

6. *The extent that the final report provides sufficient detail for replication. (To be evaluated by readers of the final report.)*

7. *Adequacy of the budget. (To be evaluated by the primary investigator and reflected in the final report.).* Due to the necessity of two follow-up

mailings to increase return rates, mailing costs exceeded projections. These costs were covered by expenditure savings elsewhere in the project. The final six weeks of the principal investigator's time (full-time + +) needed to synthesize the research findings and prepare of the final report were uncompensated.

8. *Interest in research findings (evidenced by inquiries and opportunities for presentation and publication of the findings).* To date, one paper (i.e., focusing on findings from the survey of special education supervisors), has been shared at a national meeting. Copies of the Final Report are being disseminated to all participants requesting results, to the Virginia Department of Education, and to other persons making individual requests. Other dissemination efforts (e.g., conference presentations, manuscripts) should be forthcoming. Copies of any manuscripts accepted for publication will be provided to the sponsor.

9. *Sponsor's judgement of the success of the project. (To be judged by sponsor's evaluation of the final report).*

References

Adelman, H.S. (1989). Toward solving the problem of misidentification and limited intervention efficacy. *Journal of Learning Disability*, 22(10), 608-612.

Adelmen, H.S. & Taylor, L. (1986). The problems of definition and differentiation and the need for a classification system. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 19(9), 514-520.

Afflect, J., Madge, S., Adams, A., & Lowenbraun, S. (1988). Integrated classroom versus resource model: Academic viability and effectiveness. *Exceptional Children*, 54(4), 339-348.

Algozzine, B. & Ysseldyke, J.E. (1986). The future of the LD field: Screening and diagnosis. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 19(7), 394-398.

Anderegg, M., & Vergason, G. (1987). An analysis of one of the cornerstones of the regular education initiative (ERIC: EC202818).

Association for Children and Adults with Learning Disabilities (1986). *Position statement on a regular education/special education initiative* (ERIC: EC190233).

Baker, J.M., & Zigmond, N. (1990). Are regular education classes equipped to accommodate students with learning disabilities? *Exceptional Children*, 56(6), 515-526.

Bear, G., Clever, A., & Proctor, W. (1991). Self-perceptions of nonhandicapped children and children with learning disabilities in integrated classes. *The Journal of Special Education*, 24(4), 409-426.

Bauwens, J., Hourcade, J.J., & Friend, M. (1989). Cooperative teaching: A model for general and special education integration. *Rededial and Special education*, 56, 515-526.

Beltempo, J. & Achille, P.A. (1990). The effect of special class placement on the self-concept of children with learning disabilities. *Child Study Journal*, 20(2), 81-103.

Billingsley, B. & Houck, C. (1988). Improving secondary learning disabilities programs: A system-wide participatory model. *Planning and Changing*, 19(4), 205-215.

Bryan, T., Bay, M, & Donahue, M. (1988). Implications of the learning disabilities for the regular education initiative. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 21(1), 23-28.

Byrnes, M. (1990). The regular education initiative debate: A view from the field. *Exceptional Children* 56(4), 345-349.

California State Department of Education (1988). *The general education/special education interface task force report* Sacramento, CA: Division of Special Education (ERIC: ED314895).

Coates, R.D. (1989). The Regular Education Initiative and opinions of regular classroom teachers. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 22 (9), 532-536.

Coles, G.S. (1989). Excerpts from The Learning Mystique: A Critical Look at "Learning Disabilities." *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 22(5), 267-273 & 277.

Collier, C. & Hoover, J.J. (1987). Sociocultural considerations when referring minority children for learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Focus*, 3(1), 39-45.

Cooper, D., & Speece, D. (1990). Maintaining at-risk children in regular education settings: Initial effects of individual differences and classroom environments. *Exceptional Children*, 57(2), 117-126.

Davis, W.E. (1989). The Regular Education Initiative debate: Its promises and problems. *Exceptional Children*, 55, 440-447.

Davis, J.C., & Mahcady, L. (1991). The Regular Education Initiative: What do three groups of education professionals think? *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 14(4), 211-220.

Division of Learning Disabilities (1986). A response to the regular education/special education initiative. Position paper approved May, 1986).

Doyle, R., & LaGrasta, T. (1988). A policy for systemwide implementation of the "Regular Education Initiative" (ERIC: ED 306714).

Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. (1988). Evaluation of the Adaptive Learning Environment Model. *Exceptional Children*, 55(2), 115-127.

Gartner, A. (1986). Disabling help: Special education at the crossroads. *Exceptional Children*, 53(1), 72-76.

Gartner, A., & and Lipsky, K. (1989). The yoke of special education: How to break it (*Working Paper*). Rochester, NY: National Center on Education and the Economy (ERIC: ED 307792).

Garvar-Pinhsa, A., & Schmelkin, L.P. (1989). Administrators' and teachers' attitudes toward mainstreaming. *Remedial and Special Education*, 10(4), 38-43.

Hauptman, E. (1982). Communication between special educators and mainstream teachers (ERIC: EC152670).

Houck, C., Engelhard, J., & Geller, C. (1990). Special education supervisors' perceptions of secondary LD programs: A comparison with LD teachers' views. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 23(5), 320-324.

Houck, C., Geller, C., & Engelhard, J. (1988). LD teachers' perceptions of educational programs for adolescents with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 21(2), 90-97.

Houck, C., & Given, B. (1981). The status of SLD programs: Implications from a teacher survey. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 14(3), 320-325.

Jenkins, J. R. & Heinen, A. (1989). Students' preferences for service delivery: Pull-out, in-class, or integrated models. *Exceptional Children*, 55, 516-523.

Jenkins, J., Pious, C., & Peterson, D. (1988). Categorical programs for remedial and handicapped students: Issues and validity. *Exceptional Children*, 55(2), 147-158.

Kaufman, M., Kameenui, E., Birman, B., & Danielson, L. (1990). Special education and the process of change: Victim or master of educational reform? *Exceptional Children*, 57(2), 109-115.

Kauffman, J.M., Gerber, M., & Semmel, M.I. (1988). Arguable assumptions underlying the regular education initiative. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 21(1), 6-11.

Keogh, B. (1990). Narrowing the gap between policy and practice. *Exceptional Children*, 57(2), 186-190.

Lerner, J. (1987). The regular education initiative: Some unanswered questions. *Learning Disability Focus*, 3(1), 3-7.

Lieberman, L.M. (1985). Special education and regular education: A merger made in heaven? *Exceptional Children*, 51(6), 513-516.

Martin, E. (1987). Developing public policy concerning "regular" or "special" education for children with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Focus*, 3(1), 11-16.

McKinney, J., & Hocutt, A. (1988). Policy issues in the evaluation of the regular education initiative. *Learning Disability Focus*, 4(1), 15-23.

Mendenhall, W., Wackerly, D.D., & Scheaffer, R.L. (1990, *Fourth Edition*). *Mathematical Statistics with Applications* . Boston: PWS-Kent Publishing Company, page 625.

National Council on Disability (1989). *The education of students with disabilities: Where do we stand?* (A Report to the President and the Congress of the United States.) Washington, DC: National Council on Disability (ERIC: ED315961).

National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities (1987). *Issues in the delivery of educational services to individuals with learning disabilities* (Re-publication of February 21, 1982), position paper, *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 20(5),286-288.

National Joint Committee on Learning Disabilities (1991). *Providing appropriate education for students with learning disabilities in regular education classrooms.* (Position paper approved January 25, 1991).

New York City Board of Education (1989). *Special education and a changing school policy.* Brooklyn, NY: Division of Special Education (ERIC: ED318195).

Nowaeek, E.J., McKinney, J., & Hallahan, D. (1990). Instructional behaviors of more and less effective beginning regular and special educators. *Exceptional Children*, 57(2), 140-149.

Pianta, R.C. (1990). Widening the debate on educational reform: Prevention as a viable alternative. *Exceptional Children*, 56(4), 306-313.

Reynolds, M.C., Wang, M.C., & Walberg, H.J. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and regular education. *Exceptional Children*, 53(5), 391-398.

Ross, R.P. (1990). Consistency among school psychologists in evaluating discrepancy scores: A preliminary study. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 13(3), 209-219.

Shepard, L. (1983). Assessment of Learning Disabilities. ERIC/TM Report #84.

Schulte, A., Osborne, S., & McKinney, J. (1990). Academic outcomes for students with learning disabilities in consultation and resource programs. *Exceptional Children*, 57(2), 162-172.

Semmel, M.I., Abernathy, T.V., Butera, G., & Lesar, S. (1991). Teacher perceptions of the Regular Education Initiative. *Exceptional Children*, 58(1), 9-23.

Smith, P. (1988). The regular education initiative. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children, Washington, DC (ERIC: 303974).

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. *Exceptional Children*, 51(2), 102-111.

Stainback, S., & Stainback, W. (1987). Integration versus cooperation: A commentary on "Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility." *Exceptional Children*, 54(1), 66-68.

Wagner, M. (1990). The school programs and school performance of secondary students classified as learning disabled: Findings from the national transition study of special education students. Paper presentation: American Educational Research Association, Boston, 1990.

Walsh, J.M. (1991). Student, teacher, and parent preference for less restrictive special education models: Cooperative Teaching. ERIC Document #333664.

Wang, M., & Reynolds, M. (1985). Avoiding the "Catch 22" in special education reform. *Exceptional Children*, 51(6), 497-502.

Wang, M., & Walberg, H. (1988). Four fallacies of segregationism. *Exceptional Children*, 55(2), 128-137.

Wiederholt, J.L. (1989). Restructuring special education services: The past, present, and the future. *Learning Disability Quarterly* , 12(3), 181-191.

Will, M. (1986). Educating students with learning problems -- A shared responsibility. *Exceptional Children*, 52(5), 411-415.

U.S. Department of Education, Special Education Programs, Unpublished documents.

U.S. Department of Education (1989). *Eleventh annual report to Congress on the implementation of The Education of the Handicapped Act*, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Zigmond, N., & Baker, J. (1990). Mainstream experiences for learning disabled students (Project MELD): Preliminary report. *Exceptional Children*, 57(2), 176-185.

Zigmond, N., Levin, E., & Laurie, T.E. (1985). Managing the mainstream: An analysis of teacher attitudes and student performance in mainstream high school programs. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 18(9), 535-541.

Tables and Exhibits

Table 1

SURVEY MAILING RECORD

Respondent Group	First Mailing[1,2]		Second Mailing		Third Mailing		Total Number Mailed
	Date	n	Date	n	Date	n	
1. Special Education Supervisors	11/22/91	132	12/13/91	75	1/9/92	42	249
2. General Education Supervisors	2/6/92	60	3/6/92	35	4/20/92	20	115
3. Building Principals	2/6/92	180	3/6/92	113	4/20/92	77	370
4. General Elementary Education Teachers	2/12-14/92	360	3/26/92	270	4/30/92	209	839
5. General Secondary Education Teachers	2/19-24/92	356	4/6/92	276	4/30/92	225	857
6. LD Teachers	2/5/92	354	3/3/92	232	4/20/92	138	724
7. Parents of Students with Learning Disabilities	6/12/92 6/17/92	100 17					117[3]
8. **Overall Totals**		1,559		1,001		711	3,271

[1] All mailings sent first class (Groups 1-6 at $0.52; Group 7 at $0.58).

[2] Printed pre-paid return envelopes were included in each mailing at $0.33.

[3] Parent surveys distributed by school or LDA representative. Count is based on numbers of instruments sent to distributing parties.

fn=mailrecd

Table 2

Overview of Professional Respondents' Characteristics[1]

	Extent of Integration Efforts		
Roles	**Extensive Efforts**	**Some Active Efforts**	**No Active Efforts**
Building Principals	Male: 25 (55.6%) Female: 20(44.4%)	Male: 36 (73.5%) Female: 13 (26.5%)	Male: 22 (81.5% Female 5 (18.5%)
General Education Teachers: Secondary	Male: 25 (39.7) Female 38 (60.3%)	Male: 20 (32.3%) Female: 42 (67.7%)	Male: 9 (37.5%) Female 15 (62.5)
General Education Teachers: Elementary	Male: 3 (5.2%) Female: 55 (94.8%)	Male: 5 (6.9%) Female: 67 (93.1%)	Male: 4 (17.4%) Female: 19 (82.6%
LD Teachers	Male: 2 (1.9%) Female: 101 (98.1%)	Male: 3 (3.5%) Female: 82 (96.5%)	Male: 1 (3.0%) Female: 32 (97.0%)
Ethnicity			
Building Principals	African American: 5 (11.1%) Caucasian: 40 (88.9%)	African American: 8 (16.3%) Caucasian: 41 (83%)	African American: 5 (22%) Caucasian 22 (81.5%
General Education Teachers: Secondary	Asian: 1 (1.6) African American 2 (3.2) Caucasian 60 (95.2%)	African American: 5 (8.1%) Caucasian 57 (91.9%)	African American: 2 (8.3) Caucasian: 22 (91.7%)
General Education Teachers: Elementary	African American: 4 (6.9%) Caucasian: 54 (93.1%)	African American: 11 (15.3%) Caucasian: 61 (84.7%)	Asian: 1 (4.3%) African American: 2 (8.7%)) Caucasian: 20 (87.0%)

---

[1] Gender, ethnicity, and years experience for building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers, and LD teachers was obtained from the State Personnel Data Tape. Number of year's experience in current position for special education and general education supervisors was collected via the survey. Individuals with incomplete or unusable returns have been excluded.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LD Teachers	Asian: 3 (2.9%) African American: 4 (3.9%) Caucasian: 96 (93.2%)	Asian: 1 (1.2%) African American: 12 (14.1%) Hispanic: 1 (1.2%) Caucasian: 71 (83.5%)	African American: 7 (21.2%) Caucasian: 26 (78.8%)
Years Professional Experience	**Mean & Standard Deviation**	**Mean & Standard Deviation**	**Mean & Standard Deviation**
Building Principals	21.49 SD = 6.44	23.53 SD = 6.25	20.26 SD = 6.72
General Elementary Education Teachers	13.33 SD = 8.29	13.40 8.25	
General Secondary Education Teachers	12.41 SD = 8.05	14.08 SD = 8.18	15.13 SD = 8.50
LD Teachers	11.72 6.15	11.52 6.77	10.85 6.12
Years In Current Position	**Mean Years Across Integration Effort Groups**[2]		
Special Education Supervisors	6.13		
General Education Supervisors	5.05		

---

[2] Mean years experience based on self-reports taken from Part II of the surveys (Missing Values: 11 for special education supervisors; 1 for general education supervisors). Gender and ethnicity not reported.

Table 3

Overview of Surveys Sent and Returned

Group	Number Sent	Number Returned	Total Number Parts I & II Returned	Total Number Part I Only Completed	Total Number Part II Only Completed	Total Number Incomplete or Unusable	Comments Re: Incomplete or Unusable Surveys
Special Education Supervisors	132	100 (76%)	100	0	0	0	–
General Education Supervisors	60	44 (73%)	36	38	0	6	1-5 - No response; 6-Response with special education teacher
Building Principals	180	120 (67%)	106	116	0	4	1 - 2 No response; 3-4 No time
General Elementary Education Teachers	360	185 (51%)	167	169	2 Late returns	16	1-12- No response; 13-14 Not qualified; 15-16 Part I late Return
General Secondary Education Teacher	356	163 (46%)	134	144	1 - Late return	17	1-13- No response; 14 - Not qualified; 15-16 Not familiar; 17- Part I late return
LD Teachers	354	238 (67%)	212	221	1 - Late return	17	1-14- No response; 15-16; No time; 17 - Part I late return
Parents of Students with Learning Disabilities[1]	117	34 (25%)	29	25			1-3 - Not parents; 4-7 - wrong address

---

[1] Parent surveys distributed by school or LDA representatives.

Table 4

RECORD OF INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED DURING FOLLOW-UP FIELD VISITS

				SITES[1]				
Categories of Persons Interviewed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	**Total Interviewed**
Special Education Supervisors	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
General Education Supervisors		1					1	2
Building Principals		2	2	1	2	1	2	10
General Classroom Teachers : Elementary		5	10	5	1	4	4	29
General Classroom Teachers: Secondary		5			3		4	12
LD Teachers - Elementary	1	1	6	3	1	1	2	15
LD Teachers - Secondary		2			2		2	6
Students with Learning Disabilities		7	6	3	3	3	9	31
Parents of Students with Learning Disabilities		2	4	2	3	2	2	15
Others	1		3		1			5
TOTALS	3	26	32	15	17	12	27	132

---

[1] System Code: 1 = Albemarle, 2 = Bedford, 3 = Fairfax, 4 = Hanover, 5 = King William, 6 = Roanoke City, 7 = Smyth.

RE: Research Question 9

Table 5

Characteristics of Students Interviewed[1]

#	System's Integration Efforts[2]	Gender	Age	Grade	IQ[3]	Ethnicity	Geographic Location
1	1	M	17-6	11	V=69 P=91 FS=78	Caucasian	Rural
2	1	F	17-7	10	V=86 P=101 FS=92	African-American	Rural
3	1	M	19-5	12	V=79 P=95 FS=85	African-American	Rural
4	1	F	11-3	4	V=90 P=63 FS=[4]	Caucasian	Rural
5	1	M	9-3	2	V=100 P=88 FS=93	Caucasian	Rural
6	1	F	12-1	6	V=102 P=99 FS=102	Caucasian	Rural
7	1	M	12-1	5	V=92 P=121 FS=105	Caucasian	Rural
8	1	M	12-3	6	V=123 P=112 FS=121	Caucasian	Urban
9	1	F	12-1	6	[5]	Caucasian	Urban
10	1	M	11-9	6	[6]	Caucasian	Urban
11	1	F	10-2	3	V=95 P=65 FS[7]	Caucasian	Suburban
12	1	M	11-9	5	V=69 P=79 FS=69	African-American	Suburban
13	1	M	9-7	3	V=106 P=105 FS=105	Caucasian	Suburban
15	2	F	17-9	12	V=76 P=65 FS=70	African-American	Rural
16	2	F	14-4	7	V=72 P=85 FS=76	Caucasian	Rural
17	1	M	12-3	5	V=79 P=69 FS=72	Caucasian	Urban

---

[1] *n* = 15.

[2] Code: 1=Extensive Efforts; 2=Some Efforts; 3=No Active Efforts to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spending the regular classroom setting.

[3] Scores provided by school division with permission.

[4] Missing

[5] Missing

[6] Missing

[7] Missing

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

#	System's Integration Efforts[8]	Gender	Age	Grade	IQ[9]	Ethnicity	Geographic Location
18	1	M	12-3	5	V=92 P=101 FS=96	Caucasian	Urban
19	1	F	10-9	4	V=100 P=100 FS=100	Caucasian	Urban
20	3	M	19-9	12	V=76 P=96 FS=82	Caucasian	Rural
21	3	F	19-8	12	V=86 P=106 FS=94	Caucasian	Rural
22	3	M	18-4	12	V=86 P=74 FS=79	Hispanic	Rural
23	3	M	19-5	12	V=111 P=108 FS=111	Caucasian	Rural
24	3	M	16-10	10	V=96 P=109 FS=102	Caucasian	Rural
25	3	F	19-4	12	V=78	Caucasian	Rural
26	3	M	13-1	5	V=88 P=88 FS=89	Caucasian	Rural
27	3	F	9-10	4	V=82 P=123 FS=101	Caucasian	Rural
28	3	M	13-1	6	V=88 P=91 FS=89	Caucasian	Rural
29	1	M	11-1	5	[10]	Caucasian	Urban
30	1	F	11-0	5	[11]	Caucasian	Urban
31	1	M	13-0	6	[12]	African-American	Urban

---

[8] Code: 1=Extensive Efforts; 2=Some Efforts; 3=No Active Efforts to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spending the regular classroom setting.

[9] Scores provided by school division with permission.

[10] Missing

[11] Missing

[12] Missing

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RE: Research Question 1

Table 6

Summary of Efforts to Increase Integration at the Elementary Level (Q1)

Group		Extensive Efforts		Some Efforts		No Active Efforts		No Opinion		Missing Responses
	n	*n* / %		*n* / %		*n* / %		*n* / %		*n*
Special Education Supervisors	100	21	21.2.	67	67.7	9	9.1	2	2.0	1
General Education Supervisors	38	17	44.7	19	50.0	2	5.3	–		–
Building Principals	116	51	45.9	48	43.2	5	4.5	7	6.3	5
General Education Teachers: Elementary	169	62	37.8	94	57.3	5	3.0	3	1.8	5
General Education Teachers: Secondary	144	37	27.2	43	31.6	3	2.2	53	39.0	8
LD Teachers	221	76	34.9	116	53.2	23	10.6	3	1.4	3
Overview Across Groups	788	264	34.5	387	50.5	47	6.1	68	8.9	22

RQ1: Integration Efforts-Elementary Level (fn=rq1.doc)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RE: Research Question 1

Table 7

Summary of Efforts to Increase Integration at the Middle School Level (Q2)

Group		Extensive Efforts		Some Efforts		No Efforts		No Opinion		Missing Responses
	n	*n* / %		*n* / %		*n* / %		*n* / %		*n*
Special Education Supervisors	100	25	25.5	60	61.2.	12	12.2	1	1.0	2
General Education Supervisors	38	13	36.1	18	50.0	4	11.1	1	2.8	2
Building Principals	116	21	21.0	46	46.0	4	4.0	29	29.0	16
General Education Teachers: Elementary	169	22	14.6	59	39.1	3	2.0	67	44.4	18
General Education Teachers: Secondary	144	41	30.1	54	39.7	3	2.2	38	27.9	8
LD Teachers	221	54	26.0	102	49.0	13	6.3	39	18.7	13
Overview Across Groups	788	176	24.1	339	46.5	39	5.3	175	24.0	59

RE: Research Question 1

Table 8

Summary of Efforts to Increase Integration at the Secondary Level (Q3)

Group		Extensive Efforts		Some Efforts		No Active Efforts		No Opinion		Missing Responses
	n	*n* /	%	*n* /	%	*n* /	%	*n* /	%	*n*
Special Education Supervisor	100	17	17.2	62	62.6	19	19.2	1	1.0	1
General Education Supervisors	38	13	35.1	18	48.6	4	10.8	2	5.4	1
Building Principals	116	22	21.6	36	35.3	7	6.9	37	36.3	14
General Education Teachers: Elementary	169	20	13.2	42	27.6	4	2.6	86	56.6	17
General Education Teachers: Secondary	144	49	36.0	60	44.1	8	5.9	19	14.0	8
LD Teachers	221	37	18.0	85	41.3	21	10.2	63	30.6	15
Overview Across Groups	788	158	21.6	303	41.4	63	8.6	208	28.4	56

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RE: Research Question 2

Table 9

Reported Presence of Guidelines, Written Philosophies, and Policies Designed to Increase Integration of Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q4)

Group		Have Adopted		Have Not Adopted		Can't Judge		Missing Responses
	n	*n* / %		*n* / %		*n* / %		*n*
Special Education Supervisors	100	15	15.5	80	82.5	2	2.1	3
General Education Supervisors	38	18	47.4	15	39.5	5	13.2	0
Building Principals	116	49	43.4	37	32.7	27	23.9	3
General Education Teachers: Elementary	169	82	50.6	18	11.1	62	38.3	7
General Education Teachers: Secondary	144	65	47.1	12	8.7	61	44.2	6
LD Teachers	221	72	33.8	90	42.3	51	23.9	8
Overall Across Groups	788	301	38.2	252	32.0	208	26.4	27

RQ2: Reported Guidelines, etc. (fn=rq2.doc)

RE: Research Question 3

Table 10

Special Education Supervisors' Report of the Extent that Specific Data Are Being Systematically Collected and Summarized on a School or System Basis for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities[1]

			Data Available for LD*		Data Available (not by category)		Data Unavailable		Can't Judge		Missing Responses
	Survey Items	Mean[2]	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n
Q33:	Number of students with specific learning disabilities within each delivery option each school year.	1.52	58	58.5	22	22.2	13	13.1	6	6.1	1
Q32:	Number of referrals for Special Education services.	1.73	34	34.3	53	53.5	8	8.1	4	4.0	1
Q34:	Educational costs in the delivery of special education servicesfor students with specific learning disabilities	1.85	36	36.4	34	34.3	22	22.2	7	7.1	1
Q22:	Standardized measures of academic achievement	1.86	27	27.0	53	53.0	16	16.0	4	4.0	0
Q26:	Rate of diplomas granted	1.90	22	22.0	57	57.0	13	13.0	8	8.0	0
Q25:	Dropout rates	1.93	16	16.0	69	69.0	9	9.0	6	6.0	0
Q23:	Absenteeism	2.04	11	11.0	70	70.0	15	15.0	4	4.0	0
Q28:	Grades for each grading period	2.14	14	14.1	53	53.5	27	27.3	5	5.1	1
Q24:	Grade retention	2.14	9	9.0	64	64.0	22	22.0	5	5.0	0
Q31:	Parental satisfaction with educational program for their LD child	2.53	15	15.2	13	13.1	63	63.6	8	8.1	1
Q27:	Students' attitudes toward learning and school	2.74	4	4.0	14	14.1	68	68.7	13	13.1	1
Q29:	Students' satisfaction in school placement	2.77	6	6.3	7	7.3	70	72.9	13	13.5	4
Q30:	Social acceptance within regular education setting	2.85	5	5.0	4	4.0	83	83.0	8	8.0	0

RQ3: Monitoring Date Maintained (fn=dove1)

---

[1] n=100

[2] Scale: 1=Data Available for LD Students, 2=Data Available (Not By Category), 3=Data Unavailable.

RE: Research Question 4

Table 11

Overall Summary of Personal Agreement with Statements Related to Use of the Integration Model For Students with Specific Learning Disabilities(Q5-21)[1]

Survey Item	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	%
Q18: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.64	0.701	30.1	29.5	3.4	1.7	35.4	13
Q5: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	1.73	0.848	45.2	37.5	7.7	5.8	3.7	12
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.95	0.893	30	37.3	12.2	6.7	14	7
Q19: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	1.95	0.814	16.6	29.4	6.8	3.5	43.7	12
Q15: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	2.01	0.815	19.8	45.2	8.3	6.2	20.5	9
Q20: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	2.04	0.917	29.1	40.5	15.8	8.6	6.1	28
Q6: Equal or superior learning opportunities area available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.	2.08	0.965	30.6	37.8	17.6	10.6	3.3	11
Q17: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.14	0.848	15.8	34.2	15.5	5.3	29.2	8

---

[1] Overall summary includes all special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers and LD teachers who completed Part I of the mail surveys (n=788).

[2] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend to Disagree, 4=Disagree.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Agree %	Tend to Agree %	Tend to Disagree %	Disagree %	No Opinion %	Missing Responses %
Q9: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.	2.23	1.025	25.6	34	18.1	14.5	7.8	15
Q7: Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.38	1.093	22.8	23.6	19.8	17.1	16.7	11
Q14: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities thought use of the integration model.	2.53	0.955	9.3	29.6	18.2	14.3	28.6	12
Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.68	0.829	6.4	35.6	39.7	16.6	1.8	9
Q21: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	2.77	1.027	13.7	23.3	30.9	28.6	3.6	36
Q13: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	2.86	0.932	8.5	21.2	35.9	25.6	8.8	11
Q11: Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.87	0.939	8.2	26.6	34.7	29.7	0.8	10
Q8: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.87	0.996	10.2	18.4	30	27.4	14	15
Q10: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.	3.48	0.754	2.4	8.2	27.2	59.9	2.3	8

RE: Research Question 4

Table 12

Summary of Special Education Supervisors' Personal Agreement with Statements Related to Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific learning Disabilities (Q5-21)[1]

Survey Items	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opining or Missing
			%	%	%	%	*n*
Q5: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	1.47	0.60	56	35	5	–	4
Q20: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	1.61	0.67	45	45	4	2	4
Q6: Equal or superior learning opportunities are available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.	1.69	0.72	43.4	44.4	9.1	2	1
Q18: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.76	0.75	29	39	5	3	24
Q15: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	1.80	0.62	26	57	4	2	11
Q19: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	1.81	0.75	25	42	3	4	26
Q9: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.	1.85	0.85	36.4	40.4	12.1	5.1	6.1

---

[1] Group *n = 100.*

[2] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend to Disagree, 4=Disagree.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opining or Missing
			%	%	%	%	*n*
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.15	0.97	28	37	20	11	4
Q17: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.20	0.80	14	41	20	5	20
Q14: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities through use of the integration model.	2.35	0.85	10	37	20	8	25
Q11: Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instruction al adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.49	0.98	18	32	33	17	--
Q13: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	2.51	0.85	9.1	41.4	31.3	13.1	1
Q21: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	2.59	0.95	16	25	42	16	1
Q7: Special education costs are reduced through use of the i integration model.	2.61	1.01	15	27	30	21	7
Q8: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.79	0.89	7	26	36	21	10
Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.83	0.70	--	34	49	17	--
Q10: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.	3.28	0.81	3	13	36	46	2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RE: Research Question 4

Table 13

Summary of General Education Supervisors' Personal Agreement with Statements Related to Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q5-21)[1]

Survey Items	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	%
Q5: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	1.21	0.41	78.9	21.1	–	–	–	–
Q18: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.53	0.72	47.4	31.6	2.6	2.6	15.8	–
Q19: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	1.55	0.57	36.8	36.8	2.6	–	23.7	–
Q20: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	1.61	0.64	45.9	43.2	8.1	–	2.7	1
Q6: Equal or superior learning opportunities area available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.	1.65	0.59	40.5	54.1	5.4	–	–	1
Q9: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.	1.69	0.71	42.1	39.5	13.2	–	5.3	–

---

[1] Group n = 38.

[2] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend to Disagree, 4=Disagree.

Survey Items	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**	**Agree**	**Tend to Agree**	**Tend to Disagree**	**Disagree**	**No Opinion**	**Missing Responses**
			%	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q15: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	1.70	0.62	36.8	52.6	7.9	–	2.6	—
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.86	0.73	31.6	42.1	18.4	–	7.9	–
Q14: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities thought use of the integration model.	2.10	0.82	15.8	42.1	13.2	5.3	23.7	–
Q17: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.11	0.63	13.2	55.3	23.7	–	7.9	–
Q21: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	2.32	1.02	23.7	36.8	23.7	15.8	–	–
Q13: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	2.49	0.95	15.8	28.9	34.2	13.2	7.9	–
Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.50	0.60	–	55.3	39.5	5.3	–	–
Q8: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.58	1.02	15.8	28.9	28.9	21.1	5.3	–
Q7: Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.61	1.13	23.7	18.4	31.6	26.3	–	–
Q11: Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.82	0.80	2.6	34.2	42.1	21.1	–	–
Q10: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.	3.22	0.90	5.3	13.2	31.6	44.7	5.3	–

RE: Research Question 4

Table 14

Summary of Principals' Personal Agreement with Statements Related to Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q5-21)[1]

Survey Items	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q18: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.53	0.58	33.9	30.4	2.6	–	33	1
Q5: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	1.59	0.80	53.4	33.6	3.4	5.2	4.3	–
Q20: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	1.78	0.78	38.2	40.9	11.8	2.7	6.4	6
Q19: Research finding document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	1.81	0.73	21.1	31.6	6.1	1.8	39.5	2
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.85	0.81	31.9	42.2	10.3	4.3	11.2	–
Q6: Equal or superior learning opportunities are available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.	1.86	0.89	38.8	36.2	13.8	6	5.2	–
Q15: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	1.89	0.77	21.6	39.7	6.9	3.4	28.4	–

---

[1] Group *n* = 116.

[2] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend to Disagree, 4=Disagree.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q17: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.94	0.78	22.4	34.5	14.7	1.7	26.7	–
Q9: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.	2.05	0.95	29.6	38.3	14.8	9.6	7.8	1
Q7: Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.42	1.10	22.4	22.4	22.4	18.1	14.7	–
Q14: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities thought use of the integration model.	2.42	0.97	11.4	25.4	17.5	10.5	35.1	2
Q21: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	2.46	1.07	23.4	27.1	27.1	20.6	1.9	9
Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.58	0.79	4.3	47	33.9	13.9	0.9	1
Q11: Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instruction adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.78	0.91	8.7	27.8	40	23.5	–	1
Q13: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	2.84	0.96	10.4	20	37.4	26.1	6.1	1
Q8: Referrals and time-consuming assesaments are reduced thorough use of the integration model.	3.03	0.96	7	15.7	28.7	32.2	16.5	1
Q10: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.	3.44	0.75	2.6	7.8	32.2	57.4	–	1

RE: Research Question 4

Table 15

Summary of General Elementary Teachers' Personal Agreement with Statements Related to Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q5-21)[1]

Survey Items	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q18: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.56	0.70	34.8	23.8	4.3	1.2	36	5
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have recommended use of the integration model for student with specific learning disabilities.	1.70	0.66	33.3	41.8	7.3	0.6	17	4
Q5: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	1.96	0.93	34.8	42.1	11	9.8	2.4	5
Q17: Local parents support use of the integration model for student with specific learning disabilities.	2.08	0.83	15.8	35.8	11.5	4.8	32.1	4
Q19: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for student with specific learning disabilities who are served in he integration model.	2.17	0.91	12.2	22	11	4.9	50	5
Q20: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	2.19	0.91	21.1	44.7	18	10.6	5.6	8
Q15: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	2.20	0.88	13.3	46.7	8.5	10.3	21.2	4
Q7: Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.23	1.13	26.7	25.5	11.5	17	19.4	4

---

[1] Group n = 169.

[2] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend to Disagree, 4=Disagree.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	n
Q6: Equal or superior learning opportunities are available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.	2.26	1.02	26.7	35.8	21.8	15.2	0.6	4
Q9: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through h use of the integration model.	2.46	1.06	19.1	33.3	19.1	21.6	6.8	7
Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instruction adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.51	0.91	14.5	32.7	37	13.9	1.8	4
Q14: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities thought use of the integration model.	2.69	1.01	7.4	27.6	14.1	20.9	30.1	6
Q8: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.77	1.07	14.1	17.8	27	27	14.1	6
Q21: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	2.89	1.06	11.9	21.4	24.5	35.8	6.3	10
Q11: Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.95	0.95	6.7	27.3	30.3	35.2	0.6	4
Q13: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	3.13	0.89	5.5	15.2	34.5	38.5	6.7	4
Q10: Students with learning disability learn no differently from their non-disabled peers.	3.55	0.72	2.4	5.5	26.1	63.6	2.4	4

RE: Research Question 4

Table 16

Summary of Secondary Teachers' Personal Agreement with Statements Related to Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q5-21)[1]

Survey Items	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q18: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.69	0.71	14.1	18.3	0.7	1.4	65.5	2
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.88	0.92	29.4	30.1	7.7	6.3	26.6	1
Q5: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	1.91	0.89	33.1	40.1	10.6	7	9.2	2
Q15: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	2.00	0.86	21.8	39.4	9.2	6.3	23.2	2
Q19: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities served in the integration model.	2.02	0.66	5.6	23.9	3.5	1.4	65.5	2
Q17: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.11	0.84	11.2	30.1.	7.7	4.9	46.2	1
Q6: Equal or superior learning opportunities area available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.	2.17	0.97	24.6	37.3	17.6	11.3	9.2	2

---

[1] Group *n* = 144.

[2] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend to Disagree, 4=Disagree.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	n
Q20: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	2.29	0.93	16.7	42	18.1	12.3	10.9	6
Q9: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.	2.34	0.98	19.9	28.4	26.2	11.3	14.2	3
Q7: Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.39	1.13	20.3	21.7	14	17.5	26.6	1
Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.43	0.75	7.7	46.9	34.3	7.7	3.5	1
Q14: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities thought use of the integration model.	2.53	0.96	9.2	28.9	18.3	14.1	29.6	2
Q13: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	2.79	0.87	6.3	19	35.2	15.5	23.9	2
Q21: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	2.87	0.92	8	21.9	36.5	25.5	8	7
Q11: Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.97	0.86	4.9	22.4	39.9	29.4	3.5	1
Q8: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.98	0.95	7.8	12.1	30.5	26.2	23.4	3
Q10: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.	3.47	0.74	2.1	7.7	28	55.9	6.3	1

RE: Research Question 4

Table 17

Summary of LD Teachers' Personal Agreement with Statements Related to Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q5-21)[1]

Survey Items	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Agree %	Tend to Agree %	Tend to Disagree %	Disagree %	No Opinion %	Missing Responses *n*
Q18: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.68	0.72	32.7	35.9	4.1	2.3	24.9	4
Q5: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	1.74	0.85	45.8	38.4	8.3	6	1.4	5
Q19: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	2.01	0.86	17.5	30.4	8.8	4.6	38.7	4
Q15: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	2.11	0.84	16.5	44	10.6	7.3	21.6	3
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.13	1.00	27.4	35.2	15.1	11.9	10.5	2
Q20: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	2.19	1.00	28	33.6	21.5	12.1	4.7	7
Q6: Equal or superior learning opportunities area available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.	2.27	1.01	25.7	34.9	22.5	14.7	2.3	3

---

[1] Group *n* = 221.

[2] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend to Disagree, 4=Disagree.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	n
Q7: Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.27	1.06	25.1	23.3	21.9	13	16.7	6
Q17: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.29	0.94	16.5	28.9	20.6	8.7	25.2	3
Q9: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.	2.36	1.09	24.3	32.1	17.4	20.6	5.5	3
Q14: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities through use the integration model.	2.61	0.95	8.2	28.3	21.5	16	26	2
Q8: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.88	1.01	11.1	19	30.1	30.1	9.7	5
Q13: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	2.93	0.95	9.6	17.4	39	30.3	3.7	3
Q21: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	2.95	1.02	10.9	20.4	29.9	37.4	1.4	10
Q11: Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.96	0.96	7.8	24.4	31.3	36.4	–	4
Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.97	0.83	4.6	21.6	44.0	27.5	2.3	3
Q10: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.	3.59	0.71	1.8	7.8	20.1	69.9	0.5	2

RE: Research Question 4

Table 18

Summary of Parents' Personal Agreement with Common Survey Statements Regarding Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (From Parent Mail Survey)

Survey Items		Mean[1]	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Missing Response
	n		%	%	%	%	%	n
Q16: School administrators/supervisors and/or experts have encouraged implementation of the integration model for student with specific learning disabilities.	21	2.05	20.7	34.5	10.3	6.9	27.6	–
Q15: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the e integration model.	21	2.33	14.3	28.6	25.0	7.1	25.0	–
Q19: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between LD teachers and regular classroom teachers and other school personnel.	23	2.39	13.8	27.6	31.0	6.9	20.7	–
Q8: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	29	2.72	6.9	31.0	44.8	17.2	–	–
Q14: Dropout rates will decrease for student with specific learning disabilities through use o the integration model.	22	2.77	10.3	20.7	20.7	24.1	24.1	–
Q9: Equal or superior learning opportunities are available for student with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is use.	29	2.79	13.8	20.7	37.9	27.6	–	–
Q13 "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	27	2.96	3.6	32.1	25.0	35.7	3.6	–

---

[1] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend to Disagree, 4=Disagree.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey Items		Mean	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Missing Response
	n		%	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q18: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	11	3.00	3.4	10.3	6.9	17.2	62.1	–
Q17: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	23	3.08	–	20.7	31.0	27.6	20.7	–
Q12: Regular classroom teachers are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	29	3.28	3.4	13.8	34.5	48.3	–	–
Q20: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	28	3.39	10.3	–	27.6	58.6	3.4	–
Q11: Regular classroom teachers have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	29	3.62	3.4	6.9	13.8	75.9	–	–
Q10: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.	29	3.76	3.4	3.4	6.9	82.6	–	–

RE: Research Question 4

Table 19

Summary of Parents' Personal Agreement with Common Survey Statements Regarding Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (From Parent Interviews)[1]

Interview Item	*n*	Mean[2]	Agree %	Tend to Agree %	Tend to Disagree %	Disagree %	No Opinion %	Missing Response *n*
Q15k: School personnel have encouraged use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	14	1.36	78.6	14.3	–	7.1	–	1
Q15a: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	15	1.60	–	53.3	33.3	13.3	–	–
Q15b: Equal or superior learning opportunities area available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.	15	1.73	53.3	26.7	13.3	6.7	–	–
Q15e: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	15	1.80	40.0	40.0	20.0	–	–	–
Q15g: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities thought use of the integration model.	15	1.87	53.3	20.0	13.3	13.3	–	–
Q15h Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	15	1.87	46.7	40.0	–	6.7	6.7	–
Q15i: Local parents support use of the integration model for student with s[specific learning disabilities.	14	1.93	57.1	21.4	–	14.3	7.1	1

---

[1] Responses from interviews conducted during the follow-up field visits with 15 parents of students with specific learning disabilities.

[2] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend to Disagree, 4=Disagree.

155

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Interview Item	*n*	Mean	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Missing Response
			%	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q15j: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	15	2.53	40.0	--	26.7	33.3	--	--
Q15f: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	15	2.67	26.7	13.3	26.7	33.3	--	--
Q15c: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.	15	3.07	20.0	13.3	6.7	60.0	--	--
Q15d: Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	15	3.07	13.3	26.7	13.3	33.3	13.3	--

RE: Research Question 5

Table 20

Overall Summary of Factors Influencing Increased Integration Efforts for Serving Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q22-38)[1]

Survey Item	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q33: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.83	0.781	34.5	43.3	12.1	3.2	7	199
Q35: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.84	0.838	27.8	32.1	8.3	4.1	27.7	199
Q22: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	1.91	0.799	31	49.1	12.7	4.8	2.4	207
Q36: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	2.01	0.837	17.1	30.1	10.2	3.92	38.7	197
Q32: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	2.03	0.832	20.7	42.5	11.2	5.9	19.7	198
Q37: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	2.05	0.874	28	38.9	21.6	5.6	5.9	196
Q23: Students with specific learning disabilities have equal or superior learning opportunities when the integration model is used.	2.10	0.840	22.1	48.1	18	7	4.8	204
Q25: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) though use of the integration model.	2.16	0.962	25	41.1	15.7	12..1	6	209
Q34: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.35	0.908	13.5	33.8	21.2	9.8	21.7	197

---

[1] Group consists of special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers, and LD teachers who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3 (*n*=788).

[2] Scale: 1=To a Great Extent, 2=To Some Extent, 3=To Only a Limited Extent, 4=To No Extent.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey Item	Mean	Standard Deviation	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q31: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities thought use of the integration model.	2.36	0.900	11.6	34.1	18.5	9.8	26	195
Q28: Regular/general educators are able to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.38	0.794	11.9	45	33.9	7.4	1.7	210
Q29: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.39	0.764	10.9	43.7	37.4	6	2.1	218
Q24: Educational costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.49	1.068	18.4	25.3	21.4	19	15.9	208
Q38: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	2.55	0.972	13.6	34.7	27.4	19.5	4.7	194
Q30: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	2.63	0.971	12.6	28.5	30.9	20	8	187
Q26: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.92	1.006	8.7	23.9	24.4	34.1	8.8	211
Q27: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-disabled peers.	2.97	0.969	7.3	24.2	27.9	36.2	4.4	214

RE: Research Question 5

Table 21

Summary of Special Education Supervisors' Report of Factors Serving as the Basis for Increased Integration Efforts for Students with Learning Disabilities (Q22-38)[1]

Survey Items	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	To A Great Extent	To Some Extent	To Only A Limited Extent	To No Extent	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q33: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.52	0.73	30.2	44.4	23.8	–	1.6	37
Q35: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.65	0.66	22.6	33.9	17.7	11.3	14.5	38
Q32: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	1.73	0.61	31.3	51.6	6.3	1.6	9.4	36
Q34: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.85	0.78	9.5	30.2	31.7	20.6	7.9	37
Q22: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	1.89	0.66	43.5	47.8	5.8	1.4	1.4	31
Q36: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	1.90	0.84	24.2	37.1	11.3	1.6	25.8	38
Q26: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	1.90	0.61	6.1	33.3	15.2	39.4	6.1	34

---

[1] Group consists of special education supervisors who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3 (*n* = 100).

[2] Scale: 1=To a Great Extent, 2=To Some Extent, 3=To Only a Limited Extent, 4=To No Extent.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	To A Great Extent	To Some Extent	To Only A Limited Extent	To No Extent	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	n
Q25: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) though use of the integration model.	1.93	0.51	33.3	40.9	9.1	10.6	6.1	34
Q38: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	1.97	0.96	15.4	41.5	24.6	15.4	3.1	35
Q23: Students with specific learning disabilities have equal or superior learning opportunities when the integration model.	2.04	0.52	33.8	47.1	11.8	5.9	1.5	32
Q28: Regular/general educators are able to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.14	0.65	21.9	48.4	25	3.1	1.6	36
Q24: Education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.14	0.56	15.2	12.1	27.3	39.4	6.1	34
Q31: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities thought use of the integration model.	2.53	0.77	15.6	31.3	20.3	4.7	28.1	36
Q27: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-disabled peers.	2.74	0.54	9.1	21.2	33.3	31.8	4.5	34
Q29: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.77	0.57	12.5	39.1	40.6	6.3	1.6	36
Q30: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	2.85	0.49	20.3	31.3	34.4	10.9	3.1	36
Q37: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	2.97	1.10	38.1	31.7	25.4	1.6	3.2	37

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RE: Research Question 5

Table 22

Summary of General Education Supervisors' Report of Factors Serving as the Basis for Increased Integration Efforts for Students with Learning Disabilities (Q22-38)[1]

Survey Items	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	To A Great Extent	To Some Extent	To Only A Limited Extent	To No Extent	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q35 External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.63	0.79	48.4	22.6	16.1	–	12.9	7
Q22: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	1.65	0.71	45.2	48.4	3.2	3.2	–	7
Q23: Students with specific learning disabilities have equal or superior learning opportunities when the integration model.	1.71	0.69	41.9	45.2	12.9	–	–	7
Q36: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	1.71	0.66	35.5	45.2	9.7	–	9.7	7
Q32: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	1.73	0.74	38.7	48.4	6.5	3.2	3.2	7
Q33: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.80	0.61	29	58.1	9.7	–	3.2	7
Q37: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	1.84	0.82	38.7	41.9	16.1	3.2	–	7

---

[1] Group consists of general education supervisors who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3 (*n* = 38).

[2] Scale: 1=To A Great Extent, 2=To Some Extent, 3=To Only a Limited Extent, 4=To No Extent.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	To A Great Extent	To Some Extent	To Only A Limited Extent	To No Extent	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q25: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) though use of the integration model.	1.84	0.73	35.5	45.2	19.4	–	–	7
Q38: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	2.13	0.96	29	38.7	22.6	9.7	–	7
Q31: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities thought use of the integration model.	2.21	0.79	16.1	41.9	29	3.2	9.7	7
Q28: Regular/general educators are able to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.26	0.77	16.1	45.2	35.5	3.2	–	7
Q34: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.27	0.87	19.4	38.7	32.3	6.5	3.2	7
Q29: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.39	0.67	9.7	41.9	48.4	–	–	7
Q30: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	2.40	0.93	19.4	29	38.7	9.7	3.2	7
Q26: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.73	0.91	6.5	35.5	32.3	22.6	3.2	7
Q24: Education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.74	1.03	12.9	29	29	29	–	7
Q27: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-disabled peers.	3.03	0.87	–	32.3	25.8	35.5	6.5	7

RE: Research Question 5

Table 23

Summary of Building Principals' Report of Factors Serving as the Basis for Increased Integration Efforts for Students with Learning Disabilities (Q22-38)[1]

Survey Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	To A Great Extent	To Some Extent	To Only A Limited Extent	To No Extent	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q22: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	1.78	0.82	39.8	44.3	6.8	5.7	3.4	28
Q37: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	1.85	0.82	34.8	38.2	14.6	3.4	9	27
Q35: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.85	0.87	32.6	31.5	11.2	4.5	20.2	27
Q33: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.87	0.77	31.5	47.2	12.4	3.4	5.6	27
Q36: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	1.88	0.83	23.6	30.3	9	3.4	33.7	27
Q32: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	1.96	0.86	23.6	37.1	9	5.6	24.7	27
Q23: Students with specific learning disabilities have equal or superior learning opportunities when the integration model is used.	1.99	0.76	22.7	53.4	12.5	4.5	6.8	28
Q25: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) though use of the integration model.	2.06	0.95	29.5	39.8	14.8	10.2	5.7	28

---

[1] Group consists of principals who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3 (*n*= 116).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey Items	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	To A Great Extent	To Some Extent	To Only A Limited Extent	To No Extent	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	n
Q31: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities thought use of the integration model.	2.22	0.96	18	30.3	15.7	9	27	27
Q34: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.26	0.95	20.2	30.3	23.6	9	16.9	27
Q29: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.30	0.70	10.5	52.3	33.7	3.5	–	30
Q28: Regular/general educators are able to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.32	0.69	10.2	50	37.5	2.3	–	28
Q38: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	2.35	0.95	16.9	42.7	21.3	14.6	4.5	27
Q24: Education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.39	1.05	19.3	30.7	19.3	17	13.6	28
Q30: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	2.70	1.10	16.9	21.3	24.7	28.1	9	27
Q27: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-disabled peers.	2.92	0.94	5.7	29.9	28.7	33.3	2.3	29
Q26: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	3.10	1.01	9.1	17	25	44.3	4.5	28

---

[2] Scale: 1=To a Great Extent, 2=To Some Extent, 3=To Only a Limited Extent, 4=To No Extent.

RE: Research Question 5

Table 24

Summary of General Elementary Education Teachers' Report of Factors Serving as the Basis for Increased Integration Efforts for Students with Learning Disabilities (Q22-38)[1]

Survey Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	To A Great Extent %	To Some Extent %	To Only A Limited Extent %	To No Extent %	No Opinion %	Missing Responses *n*
Q35: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.66	0.77	33.6	29.8	3.8	3.1	29.8	38
Q33: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.71	0.75	40	40	9.2	2.3	8.5	39
Q36: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	2.08	0.95	17.6	22.1	11.5	5.3	43.5	38
Q37: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	2.11	0.94	27.5	38.2	19.8	9.2	5.3	38
Q22: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	2.12	0.95	26.2	45.2	14.3	11.9	2.4	43
Q32: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	2.19	0.88	15.3	45	10.7	9.9	19.1	38
Q29: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.22	0.81	19	40.5	31.7	4	4.8	43
Q34: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.23	0.85	13.1	37.7	16.2	6.9	26.2	39

---

[1] Group consists of respondents who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3 (*n* = 169).

175

Survey Items	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	To A Great Extent %	To Some Extent %	To Only A Limited Extent %	To No Extent %	No Opinion %	Missing Responses *n*
Q24: Education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.29	1.07	23	31	14.3	16.7	15.1	43
Q23: Students with specific learning disabilities have equal or superior learning opportunities when the integration model.	2.30	0.94	19	40.5	22.2	12.7	5.6	43
Q25: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) though use of the integration model.	2.32	1.04	21.6	39.2	14.4	18.4	6.4	44
Q28: Regular/general educators are able to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.39	0.86	13.5	42.1	31	10.3	3.2	43
Q31: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	2.40	0.93	12.2	33.6	19.8	11.5	22.9	38
Q38: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	2.67	0.99	12.1	28.8	28	22.7	8.3	37
Q26: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.79	1.05	11.9	25.4	23	30.2	9.5	43
Q30: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	2.80	0.96	9.1	25.8	31.1	25.8	8.3	37
Q27: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-disabled peers.	2.98	1.04	10.5	19.4	25	38.7	6.5	45

---

[2] Scale: 1=To a Great Extent, 2=To Some Extent, 3=To Only A Limited Extent, 4=To No Extent.

RE: Research Question 5

Table 25

Summary of General Secondary Education Teachers' Report of Factors Serving as the Basis for Increased Integration Efforts for Students with Learning Disabilities (Q22-38)[1]

Survey Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	To A Great Extent	To Some Extent	To Only A Limited Extent	To No Extent	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q35: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.76	0.68	14.9	27.2	0.9	1.8	55.3	30
Q33: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.79	0.73	30.7	47.4	5.3	3.5	13.2	30
Q32: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	2.01	0.75	18.4	46.5	12.3	3.5	19.3	30
Q22: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	2.05	0.68	16.8	60.7	15.9	2.8	3.7	37
Q36: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	2.06	0.66	6.1	29.8	5.3	1.8	57	30
Q37: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	2.16	0.83	20	39.1	25.2	4.3	11.3	29

---

[1] Group consists of general education secondary teachers who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3 (*n = 144*).

Survey Items	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	To A Great Extent	To Some Extent	To Only A Limited Extent	To No Extent	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q25: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) though use of the integration model.	2.27	0.92	18.5	40.7	21.3	11.1	8.3	36
Q29: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.39	0.72	6.7	52.4	31.4	6.7	2.9	39
Q28: Regular/general educators are able to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.41	0.75	6.5	51.9	29.6	8.3	3.7	36
Q31: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities thought use of the integration model.	2.50	0.88	7	37.7	19.3	13.2	22.8	30
Q34: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.56	0.83	8.6	33.6	12.1	6	39.7	28
Q30: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	2.58	0.92	10.3	31	30.2	15.5	12.9	28
Q24: Education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.59	0.98	11.1	25	24.1	15.7	24.1	36
Q38: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	2.60	0.89	9.6	33.3	33.3	15.8	7.9	30
Q23: Students with specific learning disabilities have equal or superior learning opportunities when the integration model.	2.67	0.81	16.4	50.9	17.3	7.3	8.2	34
Q27: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-disabled peers.	2.84	0.94	7.5	27.1	32.7	27.1	5.6	37
Q26: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.91	0.93	5.6	23.1	27.8	26.9	16.7	36

---

[2] Scale: 1=To a Great Extent, 2=To Some Extent, 3=To Only A Limited Extent, 4=To No Extent

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RE: Research Question 5

Table 26

Summary of LD Teachers' Report of Factors Serving as the Basis for Increased Integration Efforts for Students with Learning Disabilities (Q22-38)[1]

Survey Items	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	To A Great Extent	To Some Extent	To Only A Limited Extent	To No Extent	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q33: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.87	0.88	37.7	37.7	14.2	5.6	4.9	59
Q35: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.88	0.82	28.4	38.9	9.9	4.3	18.5	59
Q22: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	1.90	0.75	31.3	47.5	17.5	1.9	1.9	61
Q37: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	2.13	0.88	24.5	41.7	23.9	6.7	3.1	58
Q25: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) though use of the integration model.	2.15	0.94	24.2	42.9	16.1	11.2	5.6	60
Q36: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	2.15	0.87	14.6	31.1	13.4	5.5	35.4	57
Q23: Students with specific learning disabilities have equal or superior learning opportunities when the integration model is used.	2.16	0.81	18.6	50.3	21.7	6.2	3.1	60

---

[1] Group consists of LD teachers who selected response values 1 0r 2 for Q1-Q3 (*n* = *221*).

[2] Scale: 1=To a Great Extent, 2=To Some Extent, 3=To Only a Limited Extent, 4=To No Extent.

Survey Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	To A Great Extent	To Some Extent	To Only A Limited Extent	To No Extent	No Opinion	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q32: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	2.16	0.88	16.8	36.6	14.9	6.8	24.8	60
Q24: Education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.33	1.06	22.4	23	21.7	13.7	19.3	60
Q31: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities thought use of the integration model.	2.40	0.89	8.5	33.5	15.9	9.8	32.3	57
Q34: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.41	0.93	13.6	33.3	24.7	11.7	16.7	59
Q28: Regular/general educators are able to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.50	0.82	10.6	38.5	40.4	9.9	0.6	60
Q29: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.58	0.77	7	37.3	44.3	10.1	1.3	63
Q30: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	2.65	0.94	10.7	31.4	32	19.5	6.5	52
Q38: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	2.69	1.00	12.2	32.3	28	26.2	1.2	57
Q26: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.97	1.02	9.5	20.9	25.3	36.7	7.6	63
Q27: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-disabled peers.	3.09	0.97	6.3	22.6	24.5	44	2.5	62

RE: Research Question 6

Table 27

Overall Summary of Factors Present to Support Increased Integration Efforts for Serving Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q39-44)[1]

Attributes	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Clearly Present	Present to Some Extent	Not Present	Can't Judge	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	n
Q39: Involvement of key stakeholders(i.e., central administrators, supervisor, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementation of integration efforts.	1.82	0.626	26.2	50.4	10.7	12.7	246
Q42: Flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual schools due to the presence of the unique school characteristics.	1.88	0.689	26.3	44.3	16	13.5	194
Q40: Establishment of realistic goals for integration.	1.97	0.641	19	51.3	16.8	12.8	194
Q43: Access to necessary resources and support for integration.	2.02	0.612	15.9	55.8	17.4	10.9	191
Q41: Clear articulation of goals for integration.	2.12	0.676	15.4	46.6	26	11.9	192
Q44: A systematic process for evaluating the process and outcomes of the integration effort.	2.27	0.701	11.1	33.3	32.1	23.5	196

---

[1] Overall group consists of special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers, and LD teachers who selecting response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3 (*n* = 788).

[2] Scale: 1=Clearly Present, 2=Present to Some Extent, 3=Not Present.

RE: Research Question 6:

Table 28

Summary of Special Education Supervisors' Report of Factors Present to Support Program Change Efforts (Q39-44)[1]

Attributes	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Clearly Present %	Present to Some Extent %	Not Present %	Can't Judge %	Missing Responses *n*
Q44: A systematic process for evaluating the process and outcomes of the integration effort.	1.76	0.66	7.7	43.1	41.5	7.7	35
Q41: Clear articulation of goals for integration.	2.10	0.78	22.4	55.2	19.4	3	33
Q43: Access to necessary resources and support for integration.	2.37	0.94	21.5	63.1	13.8	1.5	35
Q42: Flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual schools due to the presence of the unique school characteristics.	2.41	0.80	46.2	44.6	9.2		35
Q40: Establishment of realistic goals for integration.	2.92	0.97	27.7	56.9	10.8	4.6	35
Q39: Involvement of key stakeholders(i.e., central administrators, supervisor, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementation of integration efforts.	2.94	1.02	32.8	60.9	6.3		36

---

[1] Group consists of special education supervisors who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3 (*n* = 100).

[2] Scale: 1=Clearly Present, 2=Present to Some Extent, 3=Not Present.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RE: Research Question 6:

Table 29

Summary of General Education Supervisors' Report of Factors Present to Support Program Change Efforts (39-44)[1]

Attributes	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Clearly Present	Present to Some Extent	Not Present	Can't Judge	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	*n*
Q42: Flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual schools due to the presence of the unique school characteristics.	1.59	0.63	45.2	41.9	6.5	6.5	7
Q39: Involvement of key stakeholders(i.e., central administrators, supervisor, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementation of integration efforts.	1.62	0.49	36.7	60	--	3.3	8
Q40: Establishment of realistic goals for integration.	1.90	0.47	16.1	77.4	6.5	--	7
Q41: Clear articulation of goals for integration.	1.93	0.52	16.1	71	9.7	3.2	7
Q43: Access to necessary resources and support for integration.	1.93	0.53	16.1	67.7	9.7	6.5	7
Q44: A systematic process for evaluating the process and outcomes of the integration effort.	2.16	0.69	13.3	43.3	26.7	16.7	8

---

[1] Group consists of general education supervisors who selected response values 1 or 2 to Q1-Q3 (*n* = 38).

[2] Scale: 1=Clearly Present, 2=Present to Some Extent, 3=Not Present.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RE: Research Question 6:

Table 30

Summary of Building Principals' Report of Factors Present to Support Program Change Efforts (Q39-44)[1]

Attributes	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Clearly Present	Present to Some Extent	Not Present	Can't Judge	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	*n*
Q39: Involvement of key stakeholders(i.e., central administrators, supervisors, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementation of integration efforts.	1.79	0.70	32.1	42	13.6	12.3	35
Q42: Flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual schools due to the presence of the unique school characteristics.	1.87	0.66	27	50.6	14.6	7.9	27
Q43: Access to necessary resources and support for integration.	1.96	0.66	21.3	50.6	18	10.1	27
Q40: Establishment of realistic goals for integration.	1.99	0.69	22.5	48.3	21.3	7.9	27
Q41: Clear articulation of goals for integration.	2.08	0.70	19.1	47.2	27	6.7	27
Q44: A systematic process for evaluating the process and outcomes of the integration effort.	2.32	0.68	9.2	35.6	34.5	20.7	29

---

[1] Group consists of principals who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3 (*n* = 116).

[2] Scale: 1=Clearly Present, 2=Present to Some Extent, 3=Not Present.

RE: Research Question 6:

Table 31

Summary of General Education Elementary Teachers' Report of Factors Present to Support Program Change Efforts (Q39-44)[1]

	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Clearly Present	Present to Some Extent	Not Present	Can't Judge	Missing Responses
Attributes			%	%	%	%	*n*
Q39: Involvement of key stakeholders(i.e., central administrators, supervisor, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementation of integration efforts.	1.77	0.60	27.1	50.8	7.6	14.4	51
Q40: Establishment of realistic goals for integration.	1.92	0.65	21.5	48.5	14.6	15.4	39
Q42: Flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual schools due to the presence of the unique school characteristics.	1.94	0.67	20.6	44.3	16	19.1	38
Q43: Access to necessary resources and support for integration.	2.02	0.57	13.1	57.7	14.6	14.6	39
Q41: Clear articulation of goals for integration.	2.06	0.69	17.6	43.5	22.1	16.8	38
Q44: A systematic process for evaluating the process and outcomes of the integration effort.	2.11	0.77	16.8	28..2	24.4	30.5	38

---

[1] Group consists of elementary general education teachers who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3 (*n* = 169).
[2] Scale: 1=Clearly Present, 2=Present to Some Extent, 3=Not Present.

RE: Research Question 6:

Table 32

Summary of General Education Secondary Teachers' Report of Factors Present to Support Program Change Efforts (Q39-44)[1]

Attributes	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Clearly Present %	Present to Some Extent %	Not Present %	Can't Judge %	Missing Responses *n*
Q39: Involvement of key stakeholders (e.g., central administrators, supervisors, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementation of integration efforts.	1.89	0.64	20.8	45.5	11.9	21.8	43
Q40: Establishment of realistic goals for integration.	1.92	0.62	18.3	49.6	12.2	20	29
Q42: Flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual schools due to the presence of the unique school characteristics.	1.99	0.70	18.3	38.3	17.4	26.1	29
Q43: Access to necessary resources and support for integration.	2.00	0.61	15.4	52.1	15.4	17.1	27
Q44: A systematic process for evaluating the process and outcomes of the integration effort.	2.12	0.73	13.9	31.3	21.7	33	29
Q41: Clear articulation of goals for integration.	2.13	0.67	13.9	44.3	24.3	17.4	29

---

[1] Group consists of secondary general education teachers who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3 (*n* = 144).

[2] Scale: 1=Clearly Present, 2=Present to Some Extent, 3=Not Present.

RE: Research Question 6:

Table 33

Summary of LD Teachers' Report of Factors Present to Support Program Change Efforts (Q39-44)[1]

Attributes	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Clearly Present %	Present to Some Extent %	Not Present %	Can't Judge %	Missing Responses *n*
Q39: Involvement of key stakeholders(i.e., central administrators, supervisor, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementation of integration efforts.	1.92	0.64	21.1	51.7	14.3	12.9	74
Q42: Flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual schools due to the presence of the unique school characteristics.	1.95	0.71	24.5	45.4	20.2	9.8	58
Q43: Access to necessary resources and support for integration.	2.11	0.63	13.3	54.5	23.6	8.5	56
Q40: Establishment of realistic goals for integration.	2.13	0.64	12.8	49.4	23.8	14	57
Q41: Clear articulation of goals for integration.	2.29	0.66	9.8	42.3	35.6	12.3	58
Q44: A systematic process for evaluating the process and outcomes of the integration effort.	2.44	0.65	6.7	31.7	42.1	19.5	57

---

[1] Group consists of LD teachers who selected response values 1 or 1 for Q1-Q3 (*n* = 221).

[2] Scale: 1=Clearly Present, 2=Present to Some Extent, 3=Not Present.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RE: Research Question 6:

Table 34

Summary of Parents' Report of Factors Present to Support Program Change Efforts (Mail Survey)

			Clearly Present	Present to Some Extent	Not Present	Can't Judge	Missing Responses
Attributes	*n*	Mean[1]	%	%	%	%	*n*
Q39: Involvement of key stakeholders(i.e., central administrators, supervisors, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementation of integration efforts.	14	1.93	25.0	43.8	18.6	12.5	13
Q40: Establishment of realistic goals for integration.	17	1.94	35.0	20.0	30.0	15.0	9
Q43: Access to necessary resources and support for integration.	17	2.06	30.0	20.0	35.0	15.0	9
Q41: Clear articulation of goals for integration.	19	2.16	30.0	20.0	45.0	5.0	9
Q42: Flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual schools due to the presence of the unique school characteristics.	19	2.26	15.0	40.0	40.0	5.0	9
Q44: A systematic process for evaluating the process and outcomes of the integration effort.	18	2.33	15.0	30.0	45.0	10.0	9

---

[1] Scale: 1=Clearly Present, 2=Present to Some Extent, 3=Not Present.

RE: Research Question 7

Table 35

Preliminary Findings Related to Students' Academic Gains By Integration Group

Achievement Area/Group	*n*	Mean Achievement Gain Adjusted for Covariate[1]	F-Value	Prob > F
Reading: Spring 1991 to Spring 1992			1.20	0.380
Group = Extensive or Some Efforts	15	0.0168		
Group = No Active Efforts	53	0.0050		

Achievement Area/Group	*n*	Mean Achievement Gain Adjusted for Covariate[2]	F-Value	Prob > F
Math: Spring 1991 to Spring 1992			0.40	0.6693
Group = Extensive or Some Efforts	15	0.1064		
Group = No Active Efforts	53	0.0236		

---

[1] Achievement test scores transformed to z-scores. Full -Scale IQ scores used as covariates.
[2] Achievement test scores transformed to z-scores. Full-Scale IQ scores used as covariates.

RE: Research Question 8

Table 36

Overall Summary of Observed Changes Attributed to Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities in Academic Year 1991-92 (Q45-57)[1]

Areas for Change	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Positive Change	No Change	Negative Change	Can't Judge	Missing Responses
			%	%	%	%	n
Q50: Parental satisfaction with the educational program provided for their child with a learning disability.	1.40	0.607	39.6	16.6	3.8	40	163
Q47: LD students' attitude toward learning and school.	1.41	0.603	45.1	20.1	4.2	30.7	160
Q48: LD students' satisfaction in school placement.	1.42	0.601	41.2	20	3.8	35	159
Q49: LD students' social acceptance within the regular education setting.	1.43	0.605	45.8	22.3	4.4	27.5	160
Q46: LD students' grades for each grading period.	1.60	0.683	31	22.9	6.9	39.2	165
Q45: Standardized measures of LD students' academic achievement	1.64	0.599	15.3	18.5	2.3	63.9	164
Q52: LD students' anticipated grades for each grading period.	1.66	0.590	23.8	31.8	3.6	40.8	163
Q56: The availability of appropriate education services for LD students.	1.68	0.698	30.2	27.7	9	33.1	165
Q54: Anticipated rate of diplomas granted to LD students.	1.70	0.621	9.4	12.8	2.1	75.8	164
Q53: Dropout rates(S) for LD students.	1.73	0.581	8.6	14.8	1.7	74.9	162
Q57: Cost efficiency in the delivery of services for LD students.	1.74	0.588	14.8	25.8	3.3	56.1	176
Q51: Absenteeism for LD students.	1.75	0.547	17.2	35.8	3.1	44	165
Q55: Number of referrals for special education services.	1.90	0.606	13.5	35.4	7.8	43.3	162

---

[1] Overall summary includes all general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers, and LD teachers who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3 in completion of Part I of the mail survey (n= 688).

[2] Scale: 1=Positive Change, 2=No Change, 3=Negative Change.

RE: Research Question 8

Table 37

Summary of Changes Observed Attributed to Integration Efforts During Academic Year 1991-92 (Q 45-57) (General Supervisors)[1]

Areas for Change	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Positive Change %	No Change %	Negative Change %	Can't Judge %	Missing Responses *n*
Q47: LD students' attitude toward learning and school.	1.11	0.32	54.8	6.5	–	38.7	7
Q50: Parental satisfaction with the educational program provided for their Child with a learning disability.	1.14	0.36	58.1	9.7	–	32.3	7
Q48: LD students' satisfaction in school placement.	1.16	0.37	51.6	9.7	–	38.7	7
Q45: Standardized measures of LD students' academic achievement.	1.20	0.42	25.8	6.5	–	67.7	7
Q49: LD students' social acceptance within the regular education settings.	1.21	0.54	51.6	6.5	3.2	38.7	7
Q56: The availability of appropriate education services for LD students.	1.26	0.45	54.8	19.4	–	25.8	7
Q52: LD students' anticipated grades for each grading period.	1.29	0.59	41.9	9.7	3.2	45.2	7
Q46: LD students' grades for each grading period.	1.44	0.73	35.5	9.7	6.5	48.4	7
Q54: Anticipated rate of diplomas granted to LD students.	1.46	0.52	22.6	19.4	–	58.1	7
Q57: Cost efficiency in the delivery of services for LD students.	1.55	0.51	29	35.5	–	35.5	7
Q51: Absenteeism for LD students.	1.55	0.52	16.1	19.4	–	64.5	7
Q53: Dropout rate(s) for LD students.	1.70	0.48	9.7	22.6	–	67.7	7
Q55: Number of referrals for special education services.	1.89	0.66	16.1	35.5	9.7	38.7	7

---

[1] Group consists of general education supervisors who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3 (*n = 38*).

[2] Scale: 1=Positive change, 2=No Change, 3=Negative Change.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RE: Research Question 8

Table 38

Summary of Changes Observed Attributed to Integration Efforts During Academic Year 1991-92 (Q45-57) (Building Principals)[1]

Areas for Change	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Positive Change %	No Change %	Negative Change %	Can't Judge %	Missing Responses *n*
Q49: LD Students' social acceptance within the regular education settings.	1.29	0.46	58	23.9	–	18.2	28
Q50: Parental satisfaction with the educational program provided for their child with a learning disability.	1.33	0.54	50	19.3	2.3	28.4	28
Q47: LD students' attitude toward learning and school.	1.34	0.54	52.3	21.6	2.3	23.9	28
Q48: LD students' satisfaction in school placement.	1.41	0.58	47.2	23.6	3.4	25.8	27
Q46: LD students' grades for each grading period.	1.41	0.56	43	23.3	2.3	31.4	30
Q45: Standardized measures of LD students' academic achievement.	1.48	0.51	18.4	17.2	–	64.4	29
Q56: The availability of appropriate education services for LD students.	1.56	0.56	34.1	35.2	2.3	28.4	28
Q54: Anticipated rate of diplomas granted to LD students.	1.58.	0.51	9.1	12.5	–	78.4	28
Q53: Dropout rate(s) for LD students.	1.58	0.50	11.4	15.9	–	72.7	28
Q52: LD students' anticipated grades for each grading period.	1.59	0.57	27.3	31.8	2.3	38.6	28
Q57: Cost efficiency in the delivery of services for LD students.	1.67	0.53	18.5	32.1	1.2	48.1	35
Q51: Absenteeism for LD students.	1.72	0.49	18.2	42	1.1	38.6	28
Q55: Number of referrals for special education services.	1.81	0.47	14.8	50	2.3	33	28

---

[1] Group consists of principals who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3 (*n* = 116).

[2] Scale: 1=Positive change, 2=No Change, 3=Negative change.

RE: Research Question 8

Table 39

Summary of Changes Observed Attributed to Integration Efforts During Academic Year 1991-92 (Q45-57) (General Elementary Education Teachers)[1]

Areas for Change	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Positive Change %	No Change %	Negative Change %	Can't Judge %	Missing Responses *n*
Q48: LD students' satisfaction in school placement.	1.46	0.63	39.2	20	4.6	36.2	39
Q49: LD students' social acceptance within the regular education setting.	1.48	0.67	44.6	21.5	6.9	26.9	39
Q47: LD students' attitude toward learning and school.	1.48	0.66	42.3	21.5	6.2	30	39
Q50: Parental satisfaction with the educational program provided for their child with a learning disability.	1.54	0.73	33.1	13.8	7.7	45.4	39
Q52: LD students' anticipated grades for each grading period.	1.59	0.59	26.9	28.5	3.1	41.5	39
Q46: LD students' grades for each grading period.	1.63	0.68	27.1	22.5	6.2	44.2	40
Q45: Standardized measures of LD students' academic achievement.	1.63	0.61	15.4	17.7	2.3	64.6	39
Q54: Anticipated rate of diplomas granted to LD students.	1.68	0.65	7	8.5	1.6	82.9	40
Q51: Absenteeism for LD students.	1.73	0.64	19.2	26.9	5.4	48.5	39
Q53: Dropout rates(S) for LD students.	1.75	0.61	6.2	10.8	1.5	81.5	39
Q57: Cost efficiency in the delivery of services for LD students.	1.79	0.72	15.7	18.1	7.1	59.1	42
Q56: The availability of appropriate education services for LD students.	1.85	0.76	24.6	26.9	14.6	33.8	39
Q55: Number of referrals for special education services.	2.00	0.70	14.5	30.5	14.5	40.5	38

---

[1] Group consists of general elementary education teachers who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3 (*n* = 169).

[2] Scale: 1=Positive Change, 2=No Change, 3=Negative Change.

RE: Research Question 8

Table 40

Summary of Changes Observed Attributed to Integration Efforts During Academic Year 1991-92 (Q45-57) (General Secondary Education Teachers)[1]

Areas for Change	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Positive Change %	No Change %	Negative Change %	Can't Judge %	Missing Responses *n*
Q50: Parental satisfaction with the educational program provided for their child with a learning disability.	1.45	0.62	25.4	13.2	2.6	58.8	30
Q47: LD students' attitude toward learning and school.	1.50	0.63	33.9	20.9	4.3	40.9	29
Q49: LD students' social acceptance within the regular education setting.	1.51	0.66	38.3	21.7	6.1	33.9	29
Q48: LD students' satisfaction in school placement.	1.56	0.64	27.8	21.7	4.3	46.1	29
Q46: LD students' grades for each grading period.	1.62	0.67	25.4	21.9	5.3	47.4	30
Q56: The availability of appropriate education services for LD students.	1.69	0.62	20.4	27.4	4.4	47.8	31
Q51: Absenteeism for LD students.	1.74	0.60	18.6	31.9	4.4	45.1	31
Q54: Anticipated rate of diplomas granted to LD students.	1.75	0.69	12.4	15	4.4	68.1	31
Q53: Dropout rate(s) for LD students.	1.76	0.68	12.3	15.8	4.4	67.5	30
Q45: Standardized measures of LD students' academic achievement.	1.77	0.63	8.8	15	2.7	73.5	31
Q52: LD students' anticipated grades for each grading period.	1.78	0.69	17.5	23.7	7	51.8	30
Q55: Number of referrals for special education services.	1.82	0.64	10.6	19.5	4.4	65.5	31
Q57: Cost efficiency in the delivery of services for LD students.	1.85	0.66	8.8	16.8	4.4	69.9	31

---

[1] Group consists of general secondary education teachers who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3 (*n* = 144).

[2] Scale: 1=Positive Change, 2=No Change, 3=Negative Change.

RE: Research Question 8

Table 41

Summary of Changes Observed Attributed to Integration Efforts During Academic Year 1991-92 (Q45-57) (LD Teachers)[1]

Observed Changes	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation	Positive Change %	No Change %	Negative Change %	Can't Judge %	Missing Responses *n*
Q48: LD students' satisfaction in school placement.	1.38	0.59	47	18.9	3.7	30.5	57
Q50: Parental satisfaction with the educational program provided for their child with a learning disability.	1.39	0.57	45.7	21	3.1	30.2	59
Q47: LD students' attitude toward learning and school.	1.40	0.61	49.4	20.1	4.9	25.6	57
Q49: LD students' social acceptance within the regular education setting.	1.45	0.59	44.5	25.6	3.7	26.2	57
Q56: The availability of appropriate education services for LD students.	1.71	0.75	34.8	26.7	13	25.5	60
Q46: LD students' grades for each grading period.	1.71	0.73	30.7	26.4	11	31.9	58
Q45: Standardized measures of LD students' academic achievement.	1.72	0.61	16	23.9	3.7	56.4	58
Q52: LD students' anticipated grades for each grading period.	1.74	0.52	20.4	45.1	2.5	32.1	59
Q57: Cost efficiency in the delivery of services for LD students.	1.74	0.50	13.7	32.9	1.2	52.2	60
Q54: Anticipated rate of diplomas granted to LD students.	1.78	0.59	6.7	13.5	1.8	77.9	58
Q53: Dropout rates(S) for LD students.	1.78	0.53	6.1	15.3	1.2	77.3	58
Q51: Absenteeism for LD students.	1.80	0.47	14.3	45.3	1.9	38.5	60
Q55: Number of referrals for special education services.	1.91	0.58	13.5	41.7	8	36.8	58

---

[1] Group consists of LD teachers who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1- Q3 (*n* = 221).

[2] Scale: 1=Positive Change, 2=No Change, 3=Negative Change.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RE: Research Question 8

Table 42

Summary of Parents' Observations of Changes Associated with the Increased Time Their Child Is Spending in the Regular Classroom (From Parent Mail Survey)

		Mean[1]	Positive Change	No Change	Negative Change	Can't Judge	Missing Responses
Survey Items	*n*		%	%	%	%	*n*
Based on your observations, please indicate which, if any, changes you have noted as a result of the increased time your child is spending in the regular classroom during the 1991-92 school year?							
Q34: Your child's prospects for completing high school	14	1.57	40.0	53.3	–	6.7	14
Q35: The availability of appropriate educational services for your child	11	1.72	25.0	37.5	6.3	31.3	13
Q33: Your child's prospects for promotion this year	11	1.73	25.0	37.5	6.3	31.3	13
Q29: Your child' satisfaction in his or her school placement	16	1.81	29.4	52.9	11.8	5.9	12
Q32: Your school's school attendance	17	1.88	17.6	76.5	5.9	–	12
Q26: Standardized test measures of your child's academic achievement	14	1.92	29.4	29.4	29.4	11.8	12
Q30: Your child's social acceptance within the regular classroom(s)	14	1.93	29.4	29.4	23.5	17.6	12
Q27: Your child's grades for each grading period	15	2.00	29.4	29.4	29.4	11.8	12
Q28: Your child's attitude toward learning and school	17	2.00	29.4	41.2	29.4	–	12
Q31: Your satisfaction with the educational program provided for your child.	16	2.00	31.3	37.5	31.3	–	13

---

[1] Scale: 1=Positive Change, 2=No change, 3=Negative Change.

RE: Research Question 8

Table 43

Summary of Parents' Observations of Changes Associated with the Increased Time Their Child Is Spending in the Regular Classroom (From Parent Interviews) [1]

	n	Mean[2]	Positive Change	No Change	Negative Change	Can't Judge	Missing Response
Change Indicators			%	%	%	%	*n*
Q19g: Child's prospects for promotion/passing this year	10	1.40	60.0	40.0	–	–	5
Q19c: Child's attitude toward learning and school	12	1.42	75.0	16.7	–	8.3	3
Q19b: Grades for each grading period	13	1.46	69.2	15.4	15.4	–	2
Q19d: Child's satisfaction in his or her school placement	12	1.50	50.0	50.0	–	–	3
Q19e: Child's social acceptance within the regular classroom	12	1.50	50.0	50.0	–	–	3
Q19f: Parent's satisfaction with the educational program provided child	11	1.55	63.6	18.2	18.2 –	–	4
Q19i: Availability of appropriate educational services for child	11	1.82	45.5	36.4	9.1	9.1	4
Q19h: Child's prospects for completing high school	10	2.00	30.0	50.0	10.0	10.0	5
Q19a: Standardized tests measures of academic achievement	9	2.56	11.1	55.6	–	33.3	6

---

[1] Observations noted by 15 parents of students with specific learning disabilities interviewed during the follow-up field visits.

[2] Scale: Positive Change = 1, No Change = 2, Negative Change = 3, Can't Judge = 4.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RE: Research Question 9

Table 44

Summary of Findings from Student Interviews Conducted During Field Visits: Quantitative Summaries[1]

Respondent Characteristics	Overall Group n^2	%	Extensive or Some Active Efforts n	%	No Active Efforts n	%
Level of Active Integration Efforts:						
Systems with Extensive Integration Efforts	19	61.3				
Systems with Some Integration Efforts	4	12.9				
Systems with No Integration Efforts	8	25.8				
School System Type:						
Urban	3	9.7	3	13.0	8	100
Rural	19	61.3	11	47.8	–	–
Suburban	9	29.0	9	39.1	–	–
Students' Grade Level:						
Grade 3	4	12.9	4	17.4	–	–
Grade 4	3	9.7	2	8.7	1	12.5
Grade 5	7	22.6	7	30.4	–	–
Grade 6	6	19.4	5	21.7	1	12.5
Grade 7	1	3.2	1	4.3	–	–
Grade 10	1	3.2	1	4.3	–	–
Grade 11	1	3.2	1	4.3	–	–
Grade 12	8	25.8	2	8.7	6	75.0
Gender:						
Male	18	58.1	13	56.5	5	62.5
Female	13	41.9	10	43.5	3	37.5

---

[1] Interviews conducted in students' schools during follow-up field visits (n 31)

[2] Students in systems with extensive or some efforts combined to form one group in following table.

Ethnicity:						
African American	6	19.4	6	26.1	–	–
Caucasian	24	77.4	17	73.1	7	87.5
Hispanic	1	3.2	–	–	1	12.5
Grade LD Was Identified:						
First Grade	10	43.5	8	40.0	2	66.7
Second Grade	3	13.0	2	15.0	–	–
Third Grade	4	17.4	4	20.0	–	–
Fifth Grade	2	8.7	2	10.0	–	–
Sixth Grade	3	13.0	2	10.0	1	33.3
Seventh Grade	1	4.3	1	5.0	5	
Missing						
LD as Primary Disability:	30		22	100	8	100
Secondary Disabilities Cited:						
Emotional Disturbance	1	3.3	1	4.5	–	–
Speech and Language Impairment	3	10.0	3	13.6	–	–
Physically Impaired	1	3.3	1	4.5	–	–
Other (e.g., ADHD)	–	–	17	77.3	8	100
Mean Full-Scale Intelligence:[3]	90.8[4] (SD = 14.08)		89.7 (SD=15.32)		93.13 (SD=11.58)	
Mean Age (Years):	14.6		12.9		17.3	
Q2: Is there a particular subject or class that seems earlier to you?[5]						
Yes	27	87.1	20	87.0	7	87.5
No	3	9.7	2	8.7	1	12.5
I don't know	1	3.2	1	4.3	–	–

---

[3] Scores from the most recently administered individual intelligence test used to calculate overall group mean.

[4] n =25; 6 missing values.

[5] See Table 45 for findings from the content analysis of explanations provided to interview questions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	Overall Group		Extensive or Some Active Efforts		No Active Efforts	
Selected Survey Items	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Q3: Is there a particular class that seems more difficult for you?						
Yes	24	77.4	19	82.6	5	62.5
No	7	22.6	4	17.4	3	37.5
Q5: How do you feel the work you do in your class(es) compares with your peers?						
Better than most						
About the same as others	15	48.4	11	47.8	4	50.0
Not as good as others	7	22.6	6	26.1	1	12.5
I don't know	9	29	6	26.1	3	37.5
Q6: When you need help in your class(es), are you comfortable asking your teachers for assistance?						
All of the time						
Most of the time	15	48.4	11	47.8	4	50.0
Some of the time	7	22.6	5	21.7	2	25.0
I don't know	7	22.6	5	21.7	2	25.0
	2	6.5	2	8.7	–	–
Q7: Where do you usually receive help?						
In the classroom with the rest of my class	19	61.3	11	47.8	8	100
In a different room	11	35.5	11	47.8	–	–
Q8: When you need extra help with what you are learning in school, where would you prefer to receive help?						
In the classroom with all other students	8	25.8	2	8.7	6	75.0
In separate classroom with other students who need extra help	10	32.3	10	43.5	–	–
It does not matter	13	41.9	11	47.8	2	25.0
Q9: Do you think you get the help you need in school?						
All of the time	13	41.9	10	43.5	3	37.5
Most of the time	9	29.0	6	26.1	3	37.5
Some of the time	7	22.6	6	26.1	1	12.5
Never	1	3.2	1	4.3	1	12.5
I don't know	1	3.2	–	–	–	–

Selected Survey Items	Overall Group		Extensive or Some Active Efforts		No Active Efforts	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Q10: When you have homework, are your homework assignments the same as the other students in you classes?						
All of the time	25	80.6	18	78.8	7	87.5
Most of the time	3	9.7	2	8.7	1	12.5
Some of the time	3	9.7	3	13.0	–	–
Never						
I don't know						
Q11: Are you able to complete your homework by yourself?						
All of the time	6	19.4	4	17.4	2	25.0
Most of the time	12	38.7	8	34.8	4	50.0
Some of the time	12	38.7	10	43.5	2	25.0
Never	1	3.2	1	4.3	–	–
I don't know						
Q12: If you need help on your homework, who do you usually ask?						
Mother	14	45.2	3	13.0	3	37.5
Father	3	9.7	17	73.9	1	12.5
Other family member			3	13.0	–	–
Friend	2	6.5	–	–	2	25.0
Others	2	6.5	–	–	1	12.5
Several of the above	7	22.6	–	–	1	12.5
I don't ask anyone	3	9.7				
Q13: How do you feel about the grades you're earned this year?						
Very good	4	12.9	3	13.0	1	12.5
Good	21	67.7	17	73.9	4	50.0
Need improvement	6	19.4	3	13.0	3	37.5
I don't know						
Q14: What do you think your teacher(s) would say about your grades?						
Very Good	6	19.4	4	17.4	1	25.0
Good	12	38.7	12	52.2	–	
Need improvement	6	19.4	4	17.4	3	25.0
I don't know	7	22.6	3	13.0	4	50.0

Selected Survey Items	**Overall Group** *n*	**Overall Group** %	**Extensive or Some Active Efforts** *n*	**Extensive or Some Active Efforts** %	**No Active Efforts** *n*	**No Active Efforts** %
Q15: What do you think your parent(s) would say about your grades?						
Very good	8	25.8	5	21.7	3	37.5
Good	14	45.2	12	52.2	2	25.0
Need improvement	9	29.0	6	26.1	3	37.7
I don't know						
Q16: Overall, how do you feel about school?						
I like school a lot	13	41.9	11	47.8	2	25.0
It's OK	16	51.6	10	43.5	6	75.0
I do not like school	2	6.5	2	8.7	–	–
I don't know						
Q17a: Do you feel comfortable around other students in your classes when you are learning something new?						
All of the time	20	64.5	14	60.9	6	75.0
Most of the time	3	9.7	3	13.0	–	–
Some of the time	6	19.4	5	21.7		12.5
Never	1	3.2	1	4.3	1	12.5
I don't know	1	3.2	–	–	1	–
Q17b: Do you feel comfortable around other student in your classes when you're completing a work assignment?						
All of the time	20	64.5	15	65.2	5	62.5
Most of the time	6	19.4	5	21.7	1	12.5
Some of the time	3	9.7	2	8.7	1	12.5
Never	1	3.3	1	4.3	–	–
I don't know	1	3.2	–	–	1	12.5
Q17c: Do you feel comfortable around other student in your classes in social situations (lunch, clubs, recess, sports)?						
All of the time	22	71.0	18	78.3	4	50.0
Most of the time	5	16.1	3	13.0	2	25.0
Some of the time	3	9.7	2	8.7	1	12.5
Never	1	3.2	–	–	1	12.5
I don't know						

Selected Survey Items	Overall Group *n*	Overall Group %	Extensive or Some Active Efforts *n*	Extensive or Some Active Efforts %	No Active Efforts *n*	No Active Efforts %
Q18: Do you plan to finish high school?						
Yes	29	93.5	21	91.3	8	100
No	1	3.2	1	4.3	–	–
I don't know	1	3.2	1	4.3	–	–
Q19: Have you thought about what you would like to do when you finish school?						
Yes	27	87.1	19	82.6	8	100
No	2	6.5	2	8.7	–	–
I don't know	2	6.5	2	8.7	–	–
Q20: Do you see any problems in achieving these plans?						
Yes	8	25.8	6	26.1	2	25.0
No	19	61.3	13	56.5	6	75.0
I don't know	4	12.9	4	17.4	–	–
Q21: Tell me one thing your teacher(s) could do to help you be more successful in school.						
Answered	14	45.2	10	43.5	4	50.0
No response or not answered	17	54.8	13	56.2	4	50.0
Q22: Are there any other things that would make school and learning for you?						
Answered	14	45.2	9	39.1	5	62.5
No or no response	17	54.9	14	60.8	3	37.5
Q23: How much control do you think you have over your success at school?						
I have total control	9	29.0	7	30.4	2	25.0
I have some control	12	38.7	8	34.8	4	50.0
I have little control	3	9.7	2	8.7	1	12.5
I have no control						
I don't know	7	22.6	6	26.1	1	12.5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Selected Survey Items	**Overall Group** *n*	**Overall Group** %	**Extensive or Some Active Efforts** *n*	**Extensive or Some Active Efforts** %	**No Active Efforts** *n*	**No Active Efforts** %
Q24: Is there anything else you would like to tell me about school?						
No	19	61.3	16	69.6	3	37.5
Yes	9	29.0	7	30.4	5	62.5
No response	3	9.7	–	–	–	–

RE: Research Question 9

Table 45

Summary of Elaborative Comments from Student Interviews Conducted During Field Visits[1]

Selected Interview Queries	Comments: Active or Somewhat Active Integration Efforts	Comments: No Active Efforts to Increase Integration Efforts
Q2: Is there a particular subject or class that seems easier to you??	Math (n=5) English (n=3) Physical Education(n=2) Reading (n=2) Social Studies (n=2) Algebra (n=1) Health (n=1) Language Arts (n=1) Spelling (n=2)	Math (n=3) English (n=3) Agriculture (n=1) Government (n=1) Marketing (n=1) Social Studies (n=1)
Q2a: Why?	I enjoy it and we don't do a lot of work and sometimes do project in class Need little help in math. I've always been better in math and thought it was easier I don't have to read much. I have a reading disability. I'm good at spelling. A lot of easy words in reading. I understand the work that is assigned. When we do things all together. Because math is my best subject. Spelling is the only subject that I'm good at. It's fun to run around. Math is one of my favorite things and it's the easiest for me to do. I'm real good at reading. Teacher focuses more attention on me and has 5 or 6 students at most. I like to work with numbers. Made "A" in it -- in English not the same thing or book. Easy compared to other subjects. Doesn't have hard work. I just do well in it.	Like to do the work teacher talks better Teacher helps me a lot Two teachers helping with math. Clear notes on the board. Teacher explains things for a long time. Make things in class. I'm most used to computers; enjoy computers Good in math.

---

[1] See Table 44 for quantitative responses to interview questions.

Q3: Is there a particular class that seems more difficult for you?	Math (n=7) Social Studies (n=4) Reading (n=2) Science (n=2) Spelling (n=2) Electronics (n=1) Food Occupation (n-1) English (n=1) Health (n=1) Government (n=1)	Science (n=2) Algebra (n=1) Geometry (n=1) Math (n=1) Social Studies (n=1) English, Biology & math (n=1) Virginia History (n=1)
Q3a: Why difficult?	Not for sure. Understanding plays and grammar Need to pay more attention in class Can't usually do all the assignments It's confusing sometimes. It's harder. It's hard to remember all the words. Math is hard. Because of "times tables." Sometimes it's a little difficult. I go blank in spelling and reading. Have to do all kinds of problems -5 digits Have to follow a calendar; have to do something that day. Difficult because constantly handing in work. I don't really get information from the book. Experiments in science; following experiment is hard. Learning about resisters, Hands-on work, very complicated. Passed it with a "C." It's a little difficult because I just moved in there. I was about a month behind and it's hard to keep up. It's just different. It has lots of reading and research. It can get hard because it's hard to read. Need parents to help.	Hard-must pay attention. Hard to remember-even when I study. I don't understand; hard to find answers in book. I don't understand decimals and fractions; nervous about tests I don't understand science because I'm out of the room a lot and still have to take tests. Teacher can't teach. Even when I do the homework and pay attention it doesn't' make sense and I don't need it to graduate. All the same.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Q6: When you need help in your class(s), are you comfortable asking your teachers for assistance?	My teachers understand me. I've been with my homeroom teacher for two years and she understands me. Some topics are harder than other to ask questions about. Most of our teachers are so nice. A lot of people don't always understand and people always ask questions. Sometimes I ask friends instead of teachers. They can usually help and are often stuck on the same thing. I know they'll help me and always are glad to help. They want to see me graduate. Usually she understand and she helps me. Because if I need help, it's not hard to ask. I know that when I go to teachers and ask for help, they'll explain and work it out with me. I really like that. Usually, I know how to do assignments. Sometimes they're re so hard, I can't do them. Sometimes I am scared to ask teachers. Sometimes she is working with another person and doesn't like to be distracted . Because sometimes I feel I just ask too much. I'm not scared to ask the teacher to help me. Because I know I got LD problems. I know I need to ask; no big deal if you have LD problem. When I ask for help and others don't know it and I'm not sure or pop question. In _____'s class, sort of big class. If I need help, I'll just raise my hand. She says some kind of mumbo-jumbo, and says, "Can't you figure it out?" Never because the only person I tell is my Mom. She is the only one I can trust. I just feel like I can trust her. Some topics are hard to ask questions about and some are easy--math. When I need help, I'll ask for it.	Will ask if I need help. I'm brave enough to raise hand and ask questions. I don't know if teacher will help me sometimes. I feel embarrassed when I don't know. Because mainly, I want to see if I can do it myself. Sometimes she is too busy.
Q8: When you need extra help with what you are learning in school, where would you prefer to receive help?	In separate classroom with other students who need extra help. Like being with small groups or kids who're doing the same thing. We work together with others who need it. In a classroom with all other students. There might be a student in the class that could help me. It doesn't matter as long as I get help. When I've had help, sometimes other ask me for help. We don't get a choice. Can't judge. In the classroom with all other students because when I need help, teacher will tell class to look up there and I understand. I can get help in both places. In seperate classroom with other students who need extra help. They don't like me. They call me names. They don't care. In a separate classroom with other students who need extra help. When I'm in my class with other students, they make noise. Kids who need help don't make so much noise. It doesn't seem like any difference. In separate classroom, where ___ does her teaching.	I does not matter as long as I get help and can understand. People say "retarded" people go to other teachers. Easier to get help in classroom with all other students. Can get work down in classroom with all other students. In separate classroom, other students also need extra help. You shouldn't have to be pulled out to ask a question.

Q9: Do you think you get the help you need in school?	Sometimes need help from father; I don't get good grades. Need help to understand it and Dad helps There is someone there always to help Can always go to ___'s room during lunch Sometimes need more help with electronics Whenever I ask for help, he/she gives it to me. Teachers act like they really care about me. Look after me and I know they care and want me to be like everyone else. Because I usually get help form my friends and from the teachers. Because I don't get help. Need help all of the time. I get all the help I need in one room but in another, I don't get the help I need. They are there for me if I need any help. When I usually need help and teacher is busy, I ask another student. Because I learn more stuff. All the teachers are nice and they help. A lot of people get the help they need in spelling. Sometimes I go blank and forget how t do it. I really don't know. Because it's much better, Teachers sometimes are busy with others From one teacher I get a lot of help. From another, she doesn't like me. I need help sometimes with my work. Some of the time in science and library. Teachers are sometimes busy talking with others. In literature and science sometimes.	Teachers are always willing to help. In math, a lot of help but not the right kind. Sometimes, I ask and teachers say to wait a minute and the class of over. Takes time but you can get it. I don't know. Most of the time (lists three teachers).
Q10: When you have homework, are your homework assignments the same as the other students in you classes?	Sometimes teachers give groups different work because our group is good and when she gets mad; the group gets homework. Problem is that I'm in LD class. Sometime if we have in-class math assignments and don't finish, we take it home. Sometimes she'll give us something to work on and other do not. ______gives us easier work. Some people have other things. Sometimes but I don't have homework. Don't have homework.	I don't have much. Teachers may throw in extra for others
Q11: Are you able to complete your homework by yourself?	When we're just learning, it is hard; most times, I need a little help. Didn't understand math problems or description isn't very good. Some M's and S's are hard. Usually do most of homework at school. The reading is hard. Maybe math. In math, if I don't know anything, I get Mom to help explain. Some of it is hard. It is hard and most of the time I need a little help. Sometimes I need help. Sometimes Mom gives me examples. I don't know. With double homework. I don't like it. My mom has to explain math to me or help me.	Reading Hard to find the "stuff" we have to look up Sometimes I don't know the word or the answer Need help from teachers or friends. Not know it and worrying about it. If I don't understand it.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Q13: How do you feel about the grades you've earned this year?	Don't get "A's" but do get good grades and I'm satisfied. Good because I tried harder and got better grades. I'd like to have better grades in Western History and Electronics. Very good because I am making A-Bs, only two C's. Regret earlier work. I was lazy and stayed out. Then I made a turn around, knowing teachers care about me made the difference. My parents aren't very strict about grades. Good because they are not D's. Some are good and sometimes I have trouble getting work done on time, but I've pulled up to "C." This year, I have made all good grades. I need to get them up. Good because I make a lot of honorable mentions. I have good grades. Missed many days because I was sick.	Very good about A's and B's Good but could do a little better Good the past six weeks so want to do it again They are good for what I do (Last six weeks, I worked hard to bring them up They are good enough for how things have been this year Trying hard to get through but need improvement (Haven't made but one F (Need improvement because I have low grades
Q16: Overall, how do you feel about school?	Because teacher make i t fun and easy to learn. They make it fun enough that I want to come back on weekends. Some parts are boring. It's hard to understand. Sometimes you get to meet, see, and talk with friends. Sometimes I get so frustrated. Because I'm inters in art and that makes school fun. When I come, I feel like I'm coming to a family reunion, everyone treats me real nice. I like school and need to learn. When it's nice I like to be outside. I get lonely during summer. I don't like it because we have to do dumb stuff. If you don't get along good at something, they make you get along. School isn't my favorite thing. It can be hard and makes me upset then I can't stand things. I like school a lot because they can teach me a lot of things for my next grade. I've had more fun this year and we've learned more this year. School needs improvement. Sometimes I have a bad day and I hate school. I associate with my friends, enjoy classes, and like to help others. I like work the teachers give me. I like my teachers. They are all nice. I don' know. My mom said I get to meet new friends, but they treat me like dirt. I love school. That is the only way you can get an education. You won't get a good job. Really boring sometimes. There ain't nothing I like about school.	I get to see my friends and I get a good education, but I don't like tests. Want to learn and have goals. Too much school work I don't like it that much Tiring Graduating from this "hell hole." Would not be here if I didn't have to be Want to go to college or in Army Each year-would answer differently

Q17a: Do you feel comfortable around other students in your classes when you are learning something?	Sometimes because I always feel they're getting it and they'll make fun of me All of the time because they are nice and always give support. Because if I am learning something new they are too. I feel comfortable; not different. When in lower grades, teacher had to read to me and others heard. Don't' like learning around other kids. I really like my friends and if they are mean to me we still make up. Most of the time because it is confusing to me. They can help me. I can work better when there are people around me. I can ask them for help. It's hard for me to concentrate if there is whispering in the room. My head goes crazy. I don't know. I just feel like that. Because I like it when they get in groups to do work. I guess all of us have to learn that part. If I don't know a person that well, I say I don't know. Because I know it some of the time. Sometimes don' like the kids. Because I always feel they're getting it and they'll make fun of me, they do some of the time.	If I like what I'm doing In there to learn, do not worry about who is doing what If I need something, I can raise my hand. Except for one boy who gets in trouble and makes face Sometimes given hard time about saying stupid things People think they're better than me
Q17b: Do you feel comfortable around other students in your classes when you're completing a work assignment?	Wonder what everyone else got If I have a problem I'm more than glad to ask teacher for help. Because they're there and they always help out. Usually comfortable. If I need help. I'm comfortable asking team members. I know I'm not the only one who had finished first. Because sometimes they are making too much noise. Because I don't have that much work. Because it is confusing sometimes. Because I'm really happy when I'm with the rest of my class rather than with people I don't know.	Depends on what we're doing and who understands People think they're better than others. I feel like I'm the only one in room with problems, students around me make straight "A's." A lot of friends don't make fun of me if I get something wrong.
Q17c: Do you feel comfortable around other students in your classes in social situations (lunch, clubs, recess, sports)?	I don't think I need any special treatment. I'm not really special. I am in a wheelchair and have a disability; everyone has a disability. If I'm new to the group, I feel I don't know anyone. Most of the kids like sports and do so I. Sometimes it's fun to play outside. Get to talk to friends. I usually play kickball with the boys and girls and on the playground with the girls. Trust everyone. I can compete with them.	I'm pretty good at sports. Some people are different than others, depends on what it is. Lunch will end quickly. Some people are treated differently because of LD. There is nothing to be worried about. When I go to sports, I run fast and they cheer for me.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Q19: Have you thought about what you would like to do when you finish school?	Go to college Be a lawyer or policeman Basketball Go into Navy; Navy would pay for part of tuition for UTI. Want to learn to work on diesels and want to be a truck driver Go into cosmetology. Want to be a hair stylist Certified mason at BEC. I've lined up a job cutting lawns full-time. Want to start my own business Be a counselor for LD students. Can relate to peer pressure and negative attention I would like to be a nurse and help people who are really sick Commercial pilot and engineer I'm still trying to figure out what it would be like to be out of school Be a policeman and make my grandpa happy Be a teacher; always wanted to be one Work at McDonald's, Food Lion, or pet shop Want to be a race car driver; collect cars Baby-sitter, reporter Pediatrician Biker	Either writing or computer programming Army Architect Professional race car driver Actress, cop, dancer, model Trying to get job at Bristol Compressor, get married Air Force Pilot Move to get job in Texas Social worker Go to college/community college
Q20: Do you see any problems in achieving these plans?	Not if I work hard For basketball, I need to grow taller; I have to get really good grades and work hard Cut backs in military; if I can pass the test Sometimes I think because I'm LD , I'll never reach my goals, always want to reach goals faster Stay in school; keep motivated The special education coordinator asked for information Worried about plane crashes	Scared fans and friends may try to hurt you I need to bring grades up to make it through Air Force Getting car and training Going to be hard No major problems Court (ticket)

Q21: Tell me one thing your teacher(s) could do to help you be more successful in school.	I like working with hands and looking at things. Don't have many tests. I can't ask for anything more than they already gave The school should have more teachers in classroom so students could get more help. Make it a little funnier Help with math and spelling Teach me a little more in English. Give us a little bit more work. Make me learn faster. Help me with stuff I'm having trouble with Help me in math. Nothing. I don't know.	I don't know. Help a little more. Teachers could be nice if you are having a hard day. Need to make you want to learn and explain until you understand it. Make you read more Teachers could be more understanding
Q22: Are there any other things that would make school and learning for you?	Sitting down and showing me how to do it. Maybe have a suggestion box for students Not really. It's OK how it is now; more field trips. Each school counselor visit every class and discuss lesson on how LD doesn't make students any different If every classrooms would have a computer for every student. They could help more; a bit more than now. Have some kids kicked out of school for a month. We need more one-on-one help.	Not as much homework Review more before test Give a little work at a time I could study more, get library card, and do homework Only go half a day. Get rid of stupid teachers, rednecks, and various other low life forms I don't know .
Q24: Is there anything else you would like to tell me about school?	I think it's pretty good. Like to see it get better. Even if stays the same, a lot of kids will be happy. I look forward to next year . I'll have more teachers. The teachers are great and they help a lot. I am a cheerleader, run track, and am historian of SGA. Students need to have teachers who like and care about them Lab system was better, last year we had teachers help us on our punctuation and spelling. The lunch food is good. I think it is nice for school to put in an elevator. We have handicapped problems. I'll be a good teacher and help kids more I have enjoyed school a lot and am ready to graduate. Friends at my school will accept that I'm in a wheelchair. No, I'm not playing with someone in a wheelchair.	I just need to do better and get a little bit more help from teachers It "sucks." I like it. Excited about graduating, first one to graduate from high school

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RE: Research Question 10

Table 46

Overview of Reasons for Local Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Part II-Q58)

Reasons Cited	Special Education Supervisors		General Education Supervisors		Building Principals		General Education Teachers: Elementary		General Education Teachers: Secondary		LD Teachers		Total Across Groups	
	n	*%*	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	*n*	*%*
Administrative/Resource Reasons	21	17.2	6	11.5	34	27.5	46	27.5	17	16.3	73	31.5	197	24.6
Instructional Reasons	51	41.8	23	44.2	39	31.5	50	29.9	33	31.7	56	24.1	252	31.5
Communication Reasons	14	11.5	4	7.7	9	7.3	17	10.2	8	7.8	20	8.6	72	9
Attitudes	4	3.3	4	7.7	4	3.2	9	5.4	10	9.6	14	6.0	45	5.6
Long Range Outcomes	15	12.3	6	11.5	15	12.1	30	18	18	17.3	24	10.3	108	13.5
Outside Influences	17	13.9	9	17.3	23	18.5	15	9.0	18	17.3	45	19.4	127	15.9
Total Reasons Given	122		52		124		167		104		232		801	
Total Number of Individuals Responding	71		29		74		112		75		134		495	

RQ10: Across Groups (fn=reasons.doc).

RE: Research Question 10

Table 47

Overview of Obstacles to Increased Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Part II-Q59)

Obstacles Cited	Special Education Supervisors		General Education Supervisors		Building Principals		General Education Teachers: Elementary		General Education Teachers: Secondary		LD Teachers		Total Across Groups	
	n / %		*n* / %		*n* / %		*n* / %		*n* / %		*n* / %		*n* / %	
Attitude	83	39.9	24	34.3	35	23.3	19	10.3	18	12.7	89	27.1	268	24.7
Administrative/Resource Barriers	52	25%	14	20	42	28	38	20.5	26	18.3	82	24.7	254	23.4
Insufficient Personnel Preparation	29	13.9	19	27.1	35	23.3	29	15.7	27	19	38	11.6	177	16.3
Lack of Needed Support	24	11.5	2	2.9	8	5.3	11	6	7	4.9	29	8.8	81	7.5
Communication Obstacles	15	7.2	1	1.4	11	7.3	13	7	9	6.3	13	4.0	62	5.7
Other Influences	5	2.4	2	2.9	1	0.6	2	0.1	1	0.7	1	0.0	12	1.1
Instructional Barriers	–		8	11.4	18	12	73	39.5	54	38	77	23.4	230	21.2
Total Obstacles Cited	208		70		150		185		142		329		1084	
Total Number of Individuals Responding	90		29		74		112		75		166		546	

RQ10: Obstacles (fn=obstac.doc).

RE: Research Question 10

Table 48
Overview of Reasons for No Active Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Part II-Q60)

Reasons Cited	Special Education Supervisors		General Education Supervisors		Building Principals		General Education Teachers: Elementary		General Education Teachers: Secondary		LD Teachers		Total Responses Across Groups	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Administrative Reasons	26	43.3	4	66.7	12	27.9	17	54.8	9	56.2	48	62.3	116	49.8
Attitudes	10	16.7	–		3	7	6	19.4	1	6.3	10	13.0	30	12.9
Instructional Reasons	7	11.7	2	33.3	6	14	6	19.3	2	12.5	9	11.7	32	13.7
Communication Reasons	2	3.3	–		1	2.3	–		–		–		3	1.3
Other Needs	4	6.7	–		–		–		–		–		4	1.7
Other Responses	11	18.3	–		21	48.8	2	6.5	4	25	10	13.0	48	20.6
Number of Reasons Cited	60		6		43		31		16		77		233	
Number of Individuals Responding	44		4		30		22		14		57		171	

RQ10: Reasons for No Active Integration Efforts (fn=noactive.doc).

Table 49

Reasons for Local Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Special Education Supervisors)

Instructional Reasons (n = 51)

- Provides *least restrictive environment* for students (n = 11)
- *Pull-out* programs have not been effective (n = 8)
- Enhances social skills of students with disabilities (n = 6)
- Exposes students to more accurate content (n = 6)
- Better meets academic needs of students (n = 4)
- Increases academic knowledge and outcomes (n = 4)
- Improves regular teachers' ability to meet the needs of all students (n = 4)
- Benefits more students (n = 3)
- Enhances full continuum of service options (n = 2)
- Enhances more effective ways for dealing with learning styles (n = 2)
- Serves students in age appropriate classes (n = 1)

Administrative/Resource Reasons (n = 21)

- More effective use of special education personnel (n = 5)
- Funding constraints (transportation costs, budget) (n = 5)
- Addresses space limitations (n = 4)
- Decreases referrals and results in more appropriate referrals (n = 4)
- Low pupil/teacher ratio (n = 2)
- Stimulated by support from administration (n = 1)

Outside Influences (n = 17)

- Research findings support integration (n = 6)
- Consistent with best practices or mandates in special education (n = 4)
- Consistent with Middle School restructuring process (n = 2)
- Systems Change Project (n = 2)
- Stimulated by visits to school systems using this approach (n = 2)
- Pressure from parents (n = 1)

Long Range Outcomes (n = 15)

- Increases students' self-esteem (n = 7)
- Better prepares students for life after school (n = 3)
- Decreases dropout rates (n = 3)
- Facilitates normalization of students (n = 2)

Communication Reasons (n = 14)

- Increases understanding about students with disabilities (n = 9)
- Enables teachers to help each other (n = 3)
- Increases active involvement of general educators with special educators and disabled students (n = 2)

Attitudes (n = 4)

- Interest of special education staff (n = 2)
- Sincere willingness of teachers (n = 1)
- Integration is the "right thing to do" (n = 1)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of reasons provided by 71 Special Education supervisors.

Table 50

Reasons for Local Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (General Education Supervisors)

Instructional Reasons (n = 23)

Better meets academic needs of students (n = 8)
Provides *least restrictive environment* for students (n = 4)
Enhances social skills of students with disabilities (n = 3)
Increases academic knowledge and outcomes (n = 3)
Allows LD students to learn from peers (n = 2)
Disenchantment with pull-out programs (n = 2)
Fundamental belief that all children can learn (n = 1)

Outside Influences (n = 9)

Consistent with educational trend to keep children in classroom (n = 6)
Pressure from parents (n = 1)
Research finding supporting integration (n = 1)
Federal/state encouragement or mandates (1)

Administrative/Resource Reasons (n = 6)

More effective use of general/special education personnel (n = 3)
Stimulated by support from administration (n = 1)
Lower costs/funding constraints (transportation costs, budget) (n = 1)
Consistent with system philosophy (n = 1)

Long Range Outcomes (n = 6)

Increases students' self-esteem (n = 4)
Better prepares students for life after school (n = 2)

Communication Reasons (n = 4)

Increases active involvement of general educators with special educators and disabled students (n = 3)
Increases understanding/acceptance of students with disabilities (n = 1)

Attitudes (n = 4)

Decreases stigma of LD (n = 4)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of reasons provided by 29 general education supervisors.

Table 51

Reasons for Local Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Principals)

Instructional Reasons (n = 39)

Provides *least restrictive environment* for students (n = 11)
Better meets academic needs of students (n = 8)
Increases academic knowledge and outcomes (n = 6)
Benefits more students (n = 4)
Enhances social skills of students with disabilities (n = 4)
Disenchantment with pull-out programs (3)
Provides equal opportunity for an education (n = 2)
Allows LD students to learn from peers (n = 1)

Administrative/Resource Reasons (n = 34)

Lower costs/funding constraints (transportation costs, budget) (n = 16)
Stimulated by support from administration (n = 7)
More effective use of special & general education personnel (n = 3)
Reduces number served (n = 3)
Decreases referrals and results in more appropriate referrals (n = 1)
Reduces faculty size/special personnel (n = 1)
Limited availability of special education teachers (n = 1)
To save space (n = 1)
Concerned School Board (n = 1)

Outside Influences (n = 23)

Consistent with educational trend to keep children in classroom (n = 11)
Pressure from parents (n = 3)
Research findings support integration (n = 3)
Federal/state encouragement or mandates (n = 3)
Success observed in other school divisions (n = 2)
Social pressures (n = 1)

Long Range Outcomes (n = 15)

Increases students' self-esteem (n = 14)
Better prepares students for life after school (n = 1)

Communication Reasons (n = 9)

Increases understanding/acceptance of students with disabilities (n = 5)
Increases active involvement of general educators with special educators and disabled students (n = 4)

Attitudes (n = 4)

Decreases stigma of LD (n = 3)
Improves LD students' attitudes toward learning and school (n = 1)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of responses provided by 74 principals.

Table 52

Reasons for Local Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (General Elementary Education Teachers)

Instructional Reasons (n = 50)

Better meets academic needs of students (n = 13)
Provides *least restrictive environment* for students (n = 10)
Allows LD students to learn from peers (n = 8)
Enhances social skills of students with disabilities (n = 6)
Increases academic knowledge and outcomes (n = 5)
Provides equal opportunity for an education (n = 3)
Reduces fragmentation of school day and "LD traffic" (n = 2)
Benefits more students (n = 2)
Enhances more effective ways for dealing with learning styles (n = 1)

Administrative/Resource Reasons (n = 46)

Lower costs/funding constraints (transportation costs, budget) (n = 29)
More effective use of special education personnel (n = 4)
Stimulated by support from administration (n = 4)
Decreases referrals and results in more appropriate referrals (n = 3)
Reduces faculty size/special personnel (n = 3)
Reduce number served (n = 1)
Increases class size (n = 1)
Consistent with system's philosophy (n = 1)

Long Range Outcomes (n = 30)

Increases students' self-esteem (n = 18)
Better prepares students for life after school (n = 7)
Facilitates normalization of students (n = 3)
Decreases dropout rates (n = 2)

Communication Reasons (n = 17)

Increases understanding/acceptance of students with disabilities (n = 11)
Increases parental support (n = 3)
Increases active involvement of general educators with special educators and disabled students (n = 2)
Enables teachers to help each other (n = 1)

Outside Influences (n = 15)

Pressure from parents (n = 6)
Research findings support integration (n = 5)
Federal/state encouragement or mandates (3)
Consistent with educational trend to keep children in classroom (n = 1)

Attitudes (n = 9)

Decreases stigma of LD (n = 8)
Improves LD students' attitudes toward learning and school (n = 1)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of reasons cited by 112 general education teachers at the elementary level.

Table 53

Reasons for Local Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (General Secondary Education Teachers)

Instructional Reasons (n = 33)

Provides *least restrictive environment* for students (n = 7)
Increases academic knowledge and outcomes (n = 7)
Better meets academic needs of students (n = 6)
Allows LD students to learn from peers (n = 4)
Enhances social skills of students with disabilities (n = 3)
Benefits more students (n = 3)
Exposes students to teachers with more knowledge in specific fields (n = 2
Decrease socially inappropriate behavior (n = 1)

Outside Influences (n = 18)

Federal/state encouragement or mandates (8)
Consistent with educational trend to keep children in classroom (n = 7)
Pressure from parents (n = 3)

Long Range Outcomes (n = 18)

Increases students' self-esteem (n = 9)
Better prepares students for life after school (n = 7)
Facilitates normalization of students (n = 1)
Decreases dropout rates (n = 1)

Administrative/Resource Reasons (n = 17)

Lowers costs/funding constraints (transportation costs, budget) (n = 7)
High number of students to be served (n = 3)
More effective use of general/special education personnel (n = 2)
Stimulated by support from administration (n = 2)
Reduces number served (n = 1)
Reduces faculty size/special personnel (n = 1)
Evaluate efficacy of program options (n = 1)

Attitudes (n = 10)

Decreases stigma of LD (n = 9)
Teachers' interest in the model (n = 1)

Communication Reasons (n = 8)

Increases understanding/acceptance of students with disabilities (n = 5)
Increases active involvement of general educators with special educators and disabled students (n = 3)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of reasons cited by 75 general education teachers at the secondary level.

Table 54

Reasons for Local Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (LD Teachers)

Administrative/Resource Reasons (n = 73)

Lower costs/funding constraints (transportation costs, budget) (n = 38)
Stimulated by support from administration (n = 18)
Reduce faculty size/special personnel (n = 7)
Reduce number served (n = 4)
More effective use of special/general education personnel (n = 3)
Scheduling (n = 1)
Fade out self-contained classrooms (n = 1)
Benefit teachers (n = 1)

Instructional Reasons (n = 56)

Better meets academic needs of students (n = 21)
Provides *least restrictive environment* for students (n = 13)
Allows LD students to learn from peers (n = 7)
Increases academic knowledge and outcomes (n = 6)
Benefits more students (n = 5)
Disenchantment with pull-out programs (n = 2)
Exposes students to teachers with more knowledge in specific fields (n = 2)

Outside Influences (n = 45)

Consistent with educational trend to keep children in classroom (n = 14)
Research findings and opinion papers supporting integration (n = 10)
Influence of trends and other school systems (n = 8)
Federal/state encouragement or mandates (7)
Pressure from parents (n = 3)
Public approval (n = 2)
Exposure to concept in college course work (n = 1)

Communication Reasons (n = 20)

Increases active involvement of general educators with special educators and disabled students (n = 11)
Increases understanding/acceptance of students with disabilities (n = 9)

Long Range Outcomes (n = 24)

Increases students' self-esteem (n = 19)
Better prepares students for life after school (n = 5)

Attitudes (n = 14)

Decreases stigma of LD (n = 8)
Supported by special/general education personnel (n = 5)
Students' placement preference (n = 1)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of reasons provided by 134 LD teachers. LD teachers.

Table 55

Obstacles to Increased Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities
(Special Education Supervisors)

Attitudes (n = 83)

- Non-supportive attitudes of regular teachers (n = 24)
- Non-supportive attitudes of administrators (n = 14)
- Non-supportive attitudes of special education teachers (n = 9)
- Fear (e.g, insecurity, inadequacy) related to integration (n = 11)
- Poor attitudes - unspecified nature and origin (n = 8)
- Unwillingness to make instructional adaptations (n = 8)
- Resistance to change (n = 5)
- Negative attitudes about persons with disabilities (n = 4)

Administrative/Resource Obstacles (n = 52)

- Inadequate funds (n = 15)
- Time constraints (n = 12)
- Insufficient personnel (n = 11)
- Scheduling difficulties (n = 8)
- Large case loads (n = 3)
- Insufficient classroom size/space (n = 3)

Insufficient Personnel Preparation (n = 29)

- Inadequate training and staff inservice for model implementation (n = 25)
- Insufficient knowledge and necessary information (n = 4)

Lack of Other Needed Support (n = 24)

- Inadequate support from regular educators (n = 11)
- Inadequate support from parents (n = 6)
- Inadequate support from principals (n = 5)
- Inadequate support from special education staff (n = 1)
- Inadequate student cooperation (n = 1)

Communication Obstacles (n = 15)

- Inadequate communication/cooperation between regular and special education personnel (n = 7)
- Issues of "turf" and control (n = 7)
- Lack of clearly stated goals (n = 1)

Other Influences (n = 5)

- Insufficient flexibility of State Department of Education regarding regulations and certification requirements (n = 3)
- Insufficient data/research (n = 2)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of 208 responses provided by 90 Special Education supervisors.

Table 56

Obstacles to Increased Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (General Education Supervisors)

Attitudes (n = 24)

- Non-supportive attitudes of regular teachers (n = 10)
- Fears of general and special education teachers and parents (n = 3)
- Unwillingness to make instructional adaptations (n = 2)
- Non-supportive attitudes of administrators (n = 2)
- Resistance to change (n = 2)
- Non-supportive attitudes of parents of non-disabled students (n = 2)
- Non-supportive attitudes of special education teachers (n = 2)
- Non-supportive attitudes of parents of LD students (n = 1)

Insufficient Personnel Preparation (n = 19)

- Inadequate training of special and general education staff for model implementation (n = 19)

Administrative/Resource Obstacles (n = 14)

- Insufficient personnel (n = 4)
- Large case/class loads (n = 4)
- Inadequate funds (n = 3)
- Scheduling difficulties (n = 2)
- Insufficient time for child study (n = 1)

Instructional Barriers (n = 8)

- Inadequate time for special/general education teachers to plan together (n = 3)
- Difficulty meeting all students' needs given overburdened teachers (n = 2)
- LD students' limited performance or inappropriate behavior (n = 2)
- Excessive paperwork (n = 1)

Lack of Other Needed Support (n = 2)

- Inadequate support from principals or central administrators (n = 1)
- Inadequate support from instructional aide (n = 1)

Other Influences (n = 2)

- Insufficient data/research (n = 2)

Communication Obstacles (n = 1)

- Inadequate communication/cooperation between regular and special education personnel (n = 1)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of obstacles cited by 35 general education supervisors.

Table 57

Obstacles to Increased Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Building Principals)

Administrative/Resource Obstacles (n = 42)

Large case/class loads (n = 9)
Insufficient personnel (n = 8)
Scheduling difficulties (n = 8)
Inadequate funds (n = 7)
Seemingly inflexible regulations (e.g., IEP's) (n = 4)
Limited supplies and materials (n = 3)
Lack of distinct guidelines and evaluation plan (n = 2)
Insufficient classroom size/space (n = 1)

Attitudes (n = 35)

Non-supportive attitudes of regular teachers (n = 14)
Resistance to new ideas and change (n = 5)
Non-supportive attitudes of parents of LD students (n = 4)
Non-supportive attitudes of parents of non-disabled students (n = 4)
Unwillingness to make instructional adaptations (n = 4)
Negative attitudes about persons with disabilities (n = 2)
Unrealistic expectations of needs of LD children (n = 1)
Non-supportive attitudes of special education staff (n = 1)

Insufficient Personnel Preparation (n = 35)

Inadequate training of special and/or general education staff for model implementation (n = 35)

Instructional Barriers (n = 18)

Difficulty meeting all students needs given overburdened teachers (n = 9)
Inadequate time for special/general education teachers to plan together (n = 6)
LD students' limited performance or inappropriate behavior (n = 3)

Lack of Other Needed Support (n = 8)

Inadequate support from special education staff (n = 3)
Inadequate support from central office staff (n = 4)
Inadequate support from instructional aides (n = 1)

Communication Obstacles (n = 11)

Inadequate communication/cooperation between regular and special education personnel (n = 8)
"Unselling" special education as the miracle cure (n = 1)
Lack of teacher input in program (n = 1)
Special/general education "turf" issues (n = 1)

Other Influences (n = 1)

Lack of solid research base (n = 1)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of obstacles cited by 86 principals.

Table 58

Obstacles to Increased Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (General Elementary Education Teachers)

Instructional Barriers (n = 73)

- Difficulty meeting all students' needs given overburdened teachers (n = 46)
- LD students' limited performance or inappropriate behavior (n = 15)
- Inadequate time for special/general education teachers to plan together (n = 11)
- Excessive paperwork (n = 1)

Administrative/Resource Obstacles (n = 38)

- Inadequate funds (n = 12)
- Insufficient personnel (n = 10)
- Scheduling difficulties (n = 7)
- Insufficient classroom size/space (n = 5)
- Large case/class loads (n = 1)
- Ineffective pairing of teachers (n = 1)
- Too much time and money taken from other needs (n = 1)
- Limited supplies and materials (n = 1)

Insufficient Personnel Preparation (n = 29)

- Inadequate training and staff inservice for model implementation (n = 28)
- Administrators uninformed about benefits (n = 1)

Attitudes (n = 19)

- Unwillingness to make instructional adaptations (n = 7)
- Non-supportive attitudes of regular teachers (n = 4)
- Non-supportive attitudes of administrators (n = 3)
- Resistance to change (n = 3)
- Non-supportive attitudes of peers (n = 1)
- Negative attitudes about persons with disabilities (n = 1)

Communication Obstacles (n = 13)

- Inadequate communication/cooperation between regular and special education personnel (n = 10)
- Insufficient clarity of goals and cooperation between home and school in setting realistic goals (n = 2)
- Lack of teacher input in program (n = 1)

Lack of Other Needed Support (n = 11)

- Inadequate support from special education staff (n = 8)
- Inadequate support from principals (n = 1)
- Inadequate support from instructional aide (n = 1)
- Inadequate student cooperation/acceptance (n = 1)

Other Influences (n = 2)

- Peer pressure (n = 1)
- Insufficient data/research (n = 1)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of responses provided by 128 general education teachers at the elementary level.

Table 59

Obstacles to Increased Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (General Secondary Education Teachers:)

Instructional Barriers (n = 54)

LD students' limited performance or inappropriate behavior (n = 21)
Difficulty meeting all students' needs given overburdened teachers (n = 20)
Inadequate time for special/general education teachers to plan together (n = 11)
Lack of information on IEP goals (n = 1)
Excessive paperwork (n = 1)

Insufficient Personnel Preparation (n = 27)

Inadequate training of special and/or general education personnel for model implementation (n = 27)

Administrative/Resource Obstacles (n = 26)

Large case/class loads (n = 10)
Inadequate funds (n = 5)
Limited supplies and materials (n = 3)
Scheduling difficulties (n = 2)
Poor screening techniques (n = 2)
Too much time and money taken from other needs (n = 2)
Lack of conformity across schools (n = 1)
Insufficient classroom size/space (n = 1)

Attitudes (n = 18)

Non-supportive attitudes of regular teachers (n = 8)
Unwillingness to make instructional adaptations (n = 4)
Non-supportive attitudes from parents of non-disabled students (n = 3)
Resistance to change (n = 2)
Lack of confidence on the part of LD students (n = 1)

Communication Obstacles (n = 9)

Inadequate communication/cooperation between regular and special education personnel (n = 7)
Insufficient clarity of goals and cooperation between home and school in setting realistic goals (n = 1)
Lack of teacher input in program (n = 1)

Lack of Other Needed Support (n = 7)

Inadequate support of special education staff (n = 6)
Inadequate support of instructional aide (n = 1)

Other Influences (n = 1)

Image ? (n = 1)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of obstacles cited by 82 general education teachers at the secondary level.

Table 60

Obstacles to Increased Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (LD Teachers)

Attitudes (n = 89)

- Non-supportive attitudes of regular teachers (n = 50)
- Unwillingness to make instructional adaptations (n = 15)
- Non-supportive attitudes of parents (n = 11)
- Non-supportive attitudes and discontent of students (n = 6)
- Non-supportive attitudes of special education personnel (n = 4)
- Resistance to change (n = 3)

Administrative/Resource Obstacles (n = 82)

- Scheduling difficulties (n = 22)
- Large case/class loads (n = 17)
- Inadequate funds (n = 12)
- Insufficient clarity of program goals & organization (n = 9)
- Insufficient personnel (n = 8)
- Insufficient clarity of roles (e.g., LD teacher as aide) (n = 6)
- Too much time and money taken from other needs (n = 4)
- Limited supplies, equipment, and materials (n = 3)
- Inadequate facilities (n = 1)

Instructional Barriers (n = 77)

- Difficulty meeting all students' needs given overburdened teachers (n = 39)
- Inadequate time for special/general education teachers to plan together (n = 22)
- LD students' limited performance or inappropriate behavior (n = 14)
- Staying within IEP goals (n = 2)

Insufficient Personnel Preparation (n = 38)

- Inadequate training and staff inservice for model implementation (n = 38)

Lack of Other Needed Support (n = 29)

- Inadequate support from principals or central office staff (n = 24)
- Inadequate support from special education staff (n = 5)

Communication Obstacles (n = 13)

- Inadequate communication/cooperation between regular and special education personnel (n = 13)

Other (n = 1)

- Lack of public knowledge (n = 1)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of obstacles cited by 166 LD teachers.

Table 61

Reasons for No Active Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Special Education Supervisors)

Administrative Reasons (n = 26)

Requires additional knowledge & inservice training (n = 11)
Other issues seen as more important (n = 4)
Lack of time for preparation (n = 3)
Inadequate leadership to initiate the integration model (n = 2)
Inadequate funds (n = 2)
Requires support and involvement of *stakeholders* (n = 2)
Need for additional staff (n = 1)
High number of LD students (n = 1)

Attitudes (n = 10)

Poor teacher attitudes - unspecified (n = 3)
Lack of interest/support of regular educators (n = 3)
Regular education teachers' reluctance to work with special education teachers (n = 1)
Non-supportive attitudes of administrators at building level (n = 1)
Resistance of LD teachers (n = 1)
Lack of empathy - unspecified focus (n = 1)

Instructional Reasons (n = 7)

Current IEP process is effective (n = 3)
Better service to all students (n = 2)
Need to provide instruction in LRE based of students' needs not program model (n = 1)
Teachers & administrators think identified students need special programs (n = 1)

Communication Reasons (n = 2)

"Turf" and control issues (n = 1)
Lack of communication (n = 1)

Other Needs (n = 4)

Currently investigating the approach; need research data on efficacy of model (n = 3)
Lack of direction from State Department of Education (n = 1)

Other Responses (n = 11)

Planned initiation scheduled for 1992-93 (n = 4)
Involved in integration at some levels (n = 6)
Makes sense to empower regular education personnel (n = 1)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of responses provided by 44 Special Education supervisors.

Table 62

Reasons for No Active Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (General Education Supervisors)

Administrative Reasons (n = 4)

- Inadequate funds (n = 2)
- Requires additional knowledge & inservice training (n = 1)
- Lack of personnel (n = 1)

Instructional Reasons (n = 2)

- Teachers are overwhelmed (n = 1)
- Current IEP process is effective (n = 1)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of responses provided by four general education supervisors.

Table 63

Reasons for No Active Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Building Principals)

Other Responses (n = 21)

Lack of adequate training (n = 12)
Currently planning for implementation (n = 4)
Research findings and past experience with integration (n = 3)
No knowledge of integration model (n = 2)

Administrative Reasons (n = 12)

Inadequate funds (n = 2)
Inadequate support (n = 2)
Inadequate leadership to initiate the integration model (n = 2)
Amount of extra work required (n = 1)
System size (n = 1)
Legal concerns (n = 1)
Scheduling concerns (n = 1)
Requires additional knowledge & inservice training (n = 1)
Students are too scattered in placement (n = 1)

Instructional Reasons (n = 6)

Current IEP process/program is effective (n = 3)
No reduction in class size (n = 2)
Better service to all students (n = 1)

Attitudes (n = 3)

Lack of interest/support of regular educators (n = 3)

Communication Reasons (n = 1)

Limited communication of special education staff between schools (n = 1)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of reasons provided by 30 principals.

Table 64

Reasons for No Active Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (General Elementary Education Teachers)

Administrative Reasons (n = 17)

Inadequate funds (n = 6)
Amount of extra work required (n = 3)
Lack of adequate facilities (n = 2)
Requires additional knowledge & inservice training (n = 2)
Other issues seen as more important; too many programs under consideration (n = 2)
Inadequate leadership to initiate the integration model (n = 1)
Students are too scattered in placement (n = 1)

Attitudes (n = 6)

Lack of interest/support from regular educators (n = 6)

Instructional Reasons (n = 6)

Students' behaviors that prohibit integration (n = 2)
Current IEP process is effective (n = 2)
Better service to all students (n = 1)
No reduction in class size (n = 1)
Amount of time students with learning disabilities spend in general education is already high (n = 1)

Other Responses (n = 2)

Too many other programs under consideration (n = 1)
Research findings and past experience with integration (n = 1)
Resistance/slow to change (n = 1)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of reasons cited by 22 general education teachers at the elementary level.

Table 65

Reasons for No Active Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (General Secondary Education Teachers)

Administrative Reasons (n = 9)

- Inadequate funds (n = 4)
- Requires additional knowledge & inservice training (n = 2)
- Amount of extra work required (n = 1)
- Inadequate leadership to initiate the integration model (n = 1)
- Overcrowding in regular classrooms (n = 1)

Other Responses (n = 4)

- Currently planning for implementation or piloting elsewhere in system (n = 2)
- Research findings and past experience with integration (n = 1)
- Resistance/slow to change (n = 1)

Instructional Reasons (n = 2)

- Current IEP process is effective (n = 1)
- Special educators' lack of content area expertise (n = 1)

Attitudes (n = 1)

- Lack of interest/support from regular educators (n = 1)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of reasons provided by 14 general education teachers at the secondary level.

Table 66

Reasons for No Active Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (LD Teachers)

Administrative Reasons (n = 48)

Lack of knowledge of integration program (n = 15)
Inadequate leadership to initiate the integration model (n = 8)
Scheduling barriers (n = 4)
Inadequate funds (n = 4)
Excessive paperwork/regulations (n = 3)
Amount of extra work required (n = 3)
Lack of needed personnel (n = 3)
Lack of coordination of personnel (n = 2)
Lack of planning times (n = 2)
Lack of equipment (n = 1)
Lack of adequate facilities (n = 1)
Other issues seen as more important (n = 1)
New superintendent (n = 1)

Other Responses (n = 10)

Insufficient research findings and past experience with integration (n = 7)
Resistance/slow to change (n = 5)

Attitudes (n = 10)

Lack of interest/support of general/special educators (n = 7)
Lack of interest/support from parents (n = 3)

Instructional Reasons (n = 9)

Current IEP process/program is effective (n = 6)
Students' behaviors that prohibit integration (n = 3)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of reasons cited by 57 LD teachers.

RE: Research Question 11

Table 67

Group Differences Related to Personal Agreement with Statements Regarding Use of the Integration Model for Serving Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (Q5-21)[1]

Survey Items	F-Value	Prob > F[2]
Q5: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	9.20	0.0001*
Q6: Equal or superior learning opportunities area available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.	9.13	0.0001*
Q7: Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.03	0.0720
Q8: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	1.74	0.1239
Q9: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.	8.15	0.0001*
Q10: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.	3.53	0.0036
Q11: Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	4.55	0.0004*
Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	10.84	0.0001*
Q13: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	7.05	0.0001*
Q14: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities thought use of the integration model.	2.85	0.0148
Q15: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	4.68	0.0003*
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	5.22	0.0001*
Q17: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.16	0.0573
Q18: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.38	0.2287
Q19: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	4.04	0.0014
Q20: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	11.99	0.0001*
Q21: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	6.28	0.0001*

---

[1] Groups= Special Education Supervisors, General Education Supervisors, Building Principals, Elementary General Education Teachers, Secondary General Education Teachers, and LD Teachers who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3.

[2] Bonferonni's inequality used to control the Type I error rate at 0.05 (0.05/40 or 0.00125). Degrees of freedom = 5.

RE: Research Question 11

Table 68

Group Differences Related to Perceived Factors Influencing Increased Use of the Integration Model for Serving Students with Learning Disabilities (Q22-38)[1]

Survey Items	F-Value	Prob > F[2]
Q22: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	5.86	0.0001*
Q23: Students with specific learning disabilities have equal or superior learning opportunities when the integration model.	4.54	0.0005*
Q24: Education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	5.63	0.0001*
Q25: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) though use of the integration model.	2.04.	0.0719
Q26: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	0.79	0.5544
Q27: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-disabled peers.	1.17	0.3242
Q28: Regular/general educators are able to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.93	0.0884
Q29: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	3.75	0.0024
Q30: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	2.90	0.0136
Q31: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities thought use of the integration model.	1.24	0.2885
Q32: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	3.79	0.0023
Q33: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	0.37	0.8674
Q34: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.89	0.0952
Q35: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	3.55	0.0038
Q36: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	2.86	0.0154
Q37: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	2.61	0.0241
Q38: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	3.63	0.0031

---

[1] Groups = Special Education Supervisors, General Education Supervisors, Building Principals, Elementary General Education Teachers, Secondary General Education Teachers, and LD Teachers who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3.

[2] Bonferonni's inequality used to control the Type I error rate at 0.05 (0.05/40 or 0.00125). Degrees of freedom = 5.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

RE: Research Question 11:

Table 69

Group Differences Related to Attributes Perceived as Present to Support Increased Integration Efforts (Q39-44)[1]

Attributes	F-Value	Prob > F[2]
Q39: Involvement of key stakeholders (i.e., central administrators, supervisors, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementation of the model.	1.38	0.2299
Q40: Establishment of realistic goals for integration.	2.59	0.0249
Q41: Clear articulation of goals for integration.	3.19	0.0077
Q42: Flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual schools due to the presence of the unique school characteristics.	3.99	0.0015
Q43: Access to necessary resource and support for integration.	1.91	0.0910
Q44: A systematic process for evaluating the process and outcomes of the integration effort.	3.02	0.0108

---

[1] Groups = Special Education Supervisors, General Education Supervisors, Building Principals, Elementary General Education Teachers, Secondary General Education Teachers, and LD Teachers who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3.

[2] Bonferonni's inequality used to control the Type I error rate at 0.05 (0.05/40 or 0.00125. Degrees of freedom = 5.

RE: Research Question 11

Table 70

Group Differences Related to Changes Observed in Students with Learning Disabilities Served in Programs Using the Integration Model During Academic Year 1991-92 (Q45-57)[1]

Areas of Change	F- Value	Prob > F[2]
Q45: Standardized measures of LD students' academic achievement.	2.61	0.0373
Q46: LD students' grades for each grading period.	1.95	0.1016
Q47: LD students' attitudes toward learning and school.	2.32	0.0567
Q48: LD students' satisfaction in school placement.	1.64	0.1639
Q49: LD students' social acceptance within the regular education setting.	2.07	0.0838
Q50: Parental satisfaction with the educational program provided for their child with a learning disability.	1.73	0.1430
Q51: Absenteeism for LD students.	0.85	0.4930
Q52: LD students' anticipated grades for each grading period.	3.47	0.0086
Q53: Dropout rates(S) for LD students.	0.65	0.6270
Q54: Anticipated rate of diplomas granted to LD students.	1.08	0.3709
Q55: Number of referrals for special education services.	0.91	0.4556
Q56: The availability of appropriate education services for LD students.	4.67	0.0011*
Q57: Cost efficiency in the delivery of services for LD students.	0.96	0.4312

---

[1] Groups = General Education Supervisors, Building Principals, Elementary General Education Teachers, Secondary General Education Teachers, and LD Teachers who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3.

[2] Bonferroni's inequality used to control the Type I error rate at 0.05 (0.05/40 or 0.00125). Degrees of freedom = 4.

RE: Research Question 11

Table 71

Means and Standard Deviations for Significant ANOVAS (Questions 5-44)[1] [2]

Survey Item	Group	*n*	Mean[3]	Standard Deviation
Q5: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	Special Education Supervisors	96	1.47	0.597
	General Education Supervisors	38	1.21	0.413
	Building Principals	111	1.59	0.803
	General Education: Elementary Teachers	160	196	0.934
	General Education: Secondary Teachers	129	1.91	0.888
	LD Teachers	213	1.74	0.855
Q6: Equal or superior learning opportunities are available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is uses.	Special Education Supervisors	98	1.69	0.724
	General Education Supervisors	37	1.65	0.588
	Building Principals	110	1.86	0.893
	General Education: Elementary Teachers	164	2.26	1.02
	General Education: Secondary Teachers	129	2.17	0.969
	LD Teachers	213	2.27	1.013
Q9: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) though use of the integration model.	Special Education Supervisors	93	1.85	0.846
	General Education Supervisor	36	1.69	0.710
	Building Principals	106	2.05	0.95
	General Education: Elementary Teachers	151	2.46	1.063
	General Education: Secondary Teachers	121	2.34	0.979
	LD Teachers	206	2.36	1.09

---

[1] Groups include special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general education elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers, and LD teachers who selected response values 1 or 2 for Q1-Q3.

[2] Bonferonni's inequality used to control the Type I error rate at 0.05.

[3] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend To Disagree.

Survey Item	**Group**	***n***	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Q11: Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	**Special Education Supervisors**	100	2.49	0.98
	General Education Supervisors	38	2.82.	0.801
	Building Principals	115	2.78	0.906
	General Education: Elementary Teachers	164	2.95	0.948
	General Education: Secondary Teachers	138	2.97	0.862
	LD Teachers	217	2.96	0.962
Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	**Special Education Supervisors**	100	2.83	0.697
	General Education Supervisors	38	2.50	0.604
	Building Principals	114	2.58	0.786
	General Education: Elementary Teachers	162	2.51	0.914
	General Education: Secondary Teachers	138	2.43	0.754
	LD Teachers	213	2.97	0.832
Q13: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	**Special education Supervisors**	94	2.51	0.852
	General Education Supervisors	35	2.49	0.951
	Building Principals	108	2.84	0.959
	General Education: Elementary Teachers	154	3.13	0.891
	General Education: Secondary Teachers	108	2.79	0.865
	LD Teachers	210	2.93	0.946
Q15: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model	**Special Education Supervisors**	89	1.8	0.625
	General Education Supervisors	37	1.70	0.618
	Building Principals	83	1.89	0.765
	General Education: Elementary Teachers	130	2.20	0.875
	General Education: Secondary Teachers	109	2	0.861
	LD Teachers	171	2.11	0.843
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	**Special Education Supervisors**	96	2.15	0.973
	General Education Supervisors	35	1.86	0.733
	Building Principals	103	1.85	0.809
	General Education: Elementary Teachers	137	1.70	0.657
	General Education: Secondary Teachers	105	1.88	0.917
	LD Teachers	196	2.13	0.997

Survey Item	**Group**	***n***	**Mean**	**Standard Deviation**
Q20: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	Special Education Supervisors	96	1.61	0.671
	General Education Supervisors	36	1.61	0.645
	Building Principals	103	1.78	0.779
	General Education: Elementary Teachers	152	2.19	0.912
	General Education: Secondary Teachers	123	2.29	0.93
	LD Teachers	204	2.19	1.0
Q21: Total integration is a realistic goal for all student with specific learning disabilities.	Special Education Supervisors,	99	2.59	0.948
	General Education Supervisors	38	2.32	1.016
	Building Principals	105	2.46	1.074
	General Education: Elementary Teachers	149	2.90	1.057
	General Education: Secondary Teachers	126	2.87	0.924
	LD Teachers	208	2.95	1.016
Q22: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	Special Education Supervisors	56	1.59	0.626
	General Education Supervisor	30	1.63	0.718
	Building Principal	77	1.73	0.789
	General Education: Elementary Teachers	121	2.12	0.954
	General Education: Secondary Teachers	98	2.04	0.672
	LD Teachers	143	1.90	0.748
Q23: Students with specific learning disabilities have equal or superior learning opportunities when the integration model is uses.	Special Education Supervisors	55	1.84	0.811
	General Education Supervisors	30	1.70	0.702
	Building Principals	75	1.95	0.733
	General Education: Elementary Teachers	117	2.29	0.938
	General Education: Secondary Teachers	97	2.15	0.821
	LD Teachers	141	2.17	0.819
Q24: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g.,, number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model	Special Education Supervisors	52	3.08	1.03
	General Education Supervisors	30	2.77	1.04
	Building Principals	69	2.33	1.04
	General Education: Elementary Teachers	105	2.31	1.077
	General Education: Secondary Teachers	79	2.57	0.996
	LD Teachers	117	2.27	1.072

RE: Research Question 11

Table 72

Means and Standard Deviations for Significant ANOVAS (Survey Items 45-57)[1] [2]

Survey Item	Group	*n*	Mean[3]	Standard Deviation
Q56: The availability of appropriate education services for LD students	General Education Supervisors	22	1.23	0.429
	Building Principals	59	1.53	0.537
	General Education: Elementary Teachers	84	1.86	0.763
	General Education: Secondary Teachers	55	1.69	0.635
	LD Teachers	109	1.72	0.756

---

[1] Groups include general education supervisors, building principals, general education elementary teachers, general education secondary teachers, and LD teachers.

[2] Bonferonni's inequality used to control the Type I error rate at 0.05.

[3] Scale: 1=Positive Change, 2=No Change, 3=Negative Change.

RE: Research Question 11

Table 73

Post Hoc Analysis for Significant ANOVAS Identifying Group Differences Across All Groups: Personal Agreement(Q5-21) [1] [2]

Q5: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.

	ElemTch	SecTch	LDTch	Prin	SpedSup	GenSup
Mean[3]	1.96	1.91	1.74	1.59	1.47	1.21
n	160	129	213	111	96	38
	aaaaaaaaaa	aaaaaaaaaa	aaaaaaaaaa			
		bbbbbbbbbb	bbbbbbbbbb	bbbbbbbbbb		
			cccccccccc	cccccccccc	cccccccccc	
					dddddddddd	dddddddddd

Q6: Equal or superior learning opportunities are available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.

	LDTch	ElemTch	SecTch	Prin	SpedSup	GenSup
Mean	2.27	226	2.17	1.86	1.69	1.71
n	213	164	129	110	98	38
	aaaaaaaaaa	aaaaaaaaaa	aaaaaaaaaa	aaaaaaaaaa		
				bbbbbbbbbb	bbbbbbbbbb	bbbbbbbbbb

---

[1] Groups include special education supervisors (SpedSup), general education supervisors (GenSup), building principals (Prin), general elementary education teachers (ElemTch), general secondary education teachers (SecTch), and LD teachers (LDTch).

[2] Bonferonni's inequality used to control the Type 1 error rate at 0.05 (0.05/40 or 0.00125).

[3] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend to Disagree, 4=Disagree.

Q9: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.

	ElemTch	LDTch	SecTch	Prin	SpedSup	GenSup
Mean	2.46	2.36	2.34	205	1.85	1.69
n	151	206	121	106	93	36
	a	a	a	a		
				b	b	b

Q11: Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.

	SecTch	LDTch	ElemTch	GenSup	Prin	SpedSup
Mean	2.97	2.96	2.95	2.82	2.78	2.49
n	138	217	164	38	115	100
	a	a	a	a	a	
				b	b	b

Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.

	LDTch	SpedSup	Prin	Elem	GenSup	SecTch
Mean	2.97	2.83	2.58	2.51	2.50	2.43
n	213	100	114	162	38	138
	a	a				
		b	b	b	b	
			c	c	c	c

Q13: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.

	ElemTch	**LDTch**	**Prin**	**SecTch**	**SpedSup**	**GenSup**
Mean	3.12	2.93	2.84	2.79	2.51	2.49
n	154	210	108	108	94	35

aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

bbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbb

Q15: Post School adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.

	ElemTch	**LDTch**	**SecTch**	**Prin**	**SpedSup**	**GenSup**
Mean	220	2.11	2.00	1.89	1.80	1.70
n	130	171	109	83	89	37

aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

bbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbb

cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc

Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.

	SpedSup	**LDTch**	**SecTch**	**GenSup**	**Prin**	**ElemTch**
Mean	2.15	2.13	1.88	1.86	1.85	1.70
n	96	196	105	35	103	137

aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

bbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbb

Q20: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.

	SecTch	Elem	LDTch	Prin	SpedSup	GenSup
Mean	2.29	2.19	2.19	1.78	1.61	1.61
n	123	152	204	103	96	36

aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

bbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbb

Q21: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.

	LDTch	ElemTch	SecTch	SpedSup	Prin	GenSup
Mean	2.95	2.90	2.87	2.59	2.46	2.32
n	208	149	126	99	105	38

aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

bbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbb

cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc

RE: Research Question 11

Table 74

Post Hoc Analysis for Significant ANOVAS Identifying Group Differences Across All Groups (Q22-38): Influencing Factors [1] [2]

Q22: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.

	ElemTch	SecTch	LDTch	Prin	GenSup	SpedSup
Mean[3]	2.10	2.04	1.90	1.73	1.63	1.59
n	120	98	143	77	30	56

aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

bbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbb

---

[1] Groups include special education supervisors (SpedSup), general education supervisors (GenSup), building principals (Prin), general elementary education teachers (ElemTch), general secondary education teachers (SecTch), and LD teachers (LDTch).

[2] Bonferonni's inequality used to control the Type I error rate at 0.05 (0.05/40 or 0.00125).

[3] Scale: 1=To a Great Extent, 2=To Some Extent, 3=To Only a Limited Extent, 4=To No Extent.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Q23: Students with learning disabilities have equal or superior learning opportunities when he integration model is uses.

	ElemTch	LDTch	SecTch	Prin	SpedSup	GenSup
Mean	2.29	2.17	2.15	1.95	1.84	1.70
n	117	141	97	75	55	30

aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

bbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbb

cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc

Q24: Educational costs are reduced through use of the integration model.

	SpedSup	GenSup	SecTch	Prin	ElemTch	LDTch
Mean	3.08	2.77	2.57	2.33	2.31	2.27
n	52	30	79	69	105	117

aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

bbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbb

RE: Research Question 11

Table 75

Results of Post Hoc Analysis for Significant ANOVA Identifying Differences Across Groups: Observed Changes (Q56) [1] [2]

Q56: The availability of appropriate educational services for LD students.

	ElemTch	LDTch	SecTch	Prin	GenSup
Mean[3]	1.86	1.72	1.69	1.53	1.23
n	84	109	55	59	22

aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa

bbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbb

---

[1] Group includes general education supervisors (GenSup), building principals (Prin), general elementary education teachers (ElemTch), general secondary education teachers (SecTch), and LD teachers (LDTch).

[2] Bonferonni's inequality used to control the Type 1 error rate at 0.05 (0.05/40 or 0.00125).

[3] Scale: 1=Positive Change, 2=No Change, 3=Negative Change.

RE: Research Question 11

Table 76

Group Differences for Personal Agreement Statements (Q5-21) Based on Reported Levels of Integration Efforts: Question 1 (Elementary)[1]

Survey Items	F-Value	Prob > F[2]
Q5: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	1.82	0.1636
Q6: Equal or superior learning opportunities area available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.	5.38	0.0048
Q7: Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	1.12	0.3285
Q8: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	2.52	0.0813
Q9: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.	0.10	0.9007
Q10: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.	0.39	0.6767
Q11: Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	0.98	0.3749
Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	15.64	0.0001*
Q13: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	0.18	0.8312
Q14: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities thought use of the integration model.	0.29	0.7520
Q15: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	0.13	0.8757
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	67.37	0.0001*
Q17: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	9.66	0.0001*
Q18: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	7.58	0.0006*

---

[1] Groups= special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers, and LD teachers who reported via Q1 (1) Extensive, (2) Some, and (3) No Active Efforts to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular classroom beyond recent practice.

[2] Bonferonni's inequality used to control the Type I error rate at 0.05 (0.05/17 or 0.00294). Degrees of freedom = 2.

Survey Items	**F-Value**	**Prob > F**[3]
Q19: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	0.96	0.3835
Q20: The integration model results in a **genuine** sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	0.84	0.4343
Q21: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	1.05	0.3520

RE: Research Question 11

Table 77

Group Differences for Personal Agreement Statements (Q5-21) Based on Reported Levels of Integration Efforts: Question 2 (Middle School)[1]

Survey Items	F-Value	Prob > F[2]
Q5: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	0.22	0.8055
Q6: Equal or superior learning opportunities area available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.	0.23	0.7979
Q7: Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	3.66	0.0265
Q8: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	1.05	0.3493
Q9: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.	0.02	0.9830
Q10: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.	0.23	0.7974
Q11: Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.19	0.3039
Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	7.91	0.0004*
Q13: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	0.76	0.4693
Q14: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities thought use of the integration model.	0.65	0.5208
Q15: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	0.25	0.7805
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	41.14	0.0001*
Q17: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	3.66	0.0266
Q18: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1.40	0.2477

---

[1] Groups= special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers, and LD teachers who reported via Q1 (1) Extensive, (2) Some, and (3) No Active Efforts to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular classroom beyond recent practice.

[2] Bonferonni's inequality used to control the Type I error rate at 0.05 (0.05/17 or 0.00294). Degrees of freedom = 2.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Survey Items	F-Value	Prob > F^3
Q19: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	0.47	0.6237
Q20: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	0.77	0.4647
Q21: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	0.56	0.5698

RE: Research Question 11

Table 78

Group Differences for Personal Agreement Statements (Q5-21) Based on Reported Levels of Integration Efforts: Question 3 (High School)[1]

Survey Items	F-Value	Prob > F[2]
Q5: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	0.29	0.7465
Q6: Equal or superior learning opportunities area available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.	0.44	0.6421
Q7: Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	0.28	0.7565
Q8: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	1.08	0.3420
Q9: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.	0.71	0.4905
Q10: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.	0.17	0.8429
Q11: Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	0.29	20
Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.16	0.1162
Q13: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	0.73	0.4823
Q14: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities thought use of the integration model.	0.20	0.8172
Q15: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	0.53	0.5879
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	12.06	0.0001*
Q17: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	0.79	0.4553
Q18: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	0.04	0.9586

---

[1] Groups= special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers, and LD teachers who reported via Q1 (1) Extensive, (2) Some, and (3) No Active Efforts to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular classroom beyondrecent practice.

[2] Bonferonni's inequality used to control the Type I error rate at 0.05 (0.05/17 or 0.00294). Degrees of freedom = 2.

Survey Items	F-Value	Prob > F^3
Q19: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	0.30	0.7399
Q20: The integration model results in a **genuine** sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	2.76	0.0642
Q21: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	0.35	0.7021

RE: Research Question 11

Table 79

Item Frequencies and Means for Q 5-21 By Q1: Elementary [1]

	Extensive Efforts	Extensive Efforts	Some Active Efforts	Some Active Efforts	No Active Efforts	No Active Efforts	Missing/No Opinion
Survey Item	*n*	Mean[2]	*n*	Mean	*n*	Mean	*n*
Q5: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	261	1.69	367	1.73	44	1.95	116
Q6: Equal or superior learning opportunities are available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.	261	2.01	373	2.10	44	2.52	110
Q7: Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	225	2.46	323	2.34	36	2.25	204
Q8: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	240	2.96	325	2.78	41	2.73	182
Q9: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.	251	2.23	354	2.24	42	2.31	141
Q10: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.	261	3.50	374	3.45	47	3.53	106
Q11: Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.62	2.89	383	2.81	47	2.98	96
Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	261	2.54	3.78	2.72	46	3.24	103

---

[1] Group includes special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers, and LD teachers by Q1: Elementary (*n* = 788).

[2] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend to Disagree, 4=Disagree.

	Extensive Efforts	Extensive Efforts	Some Active Efforts	Some Active Efforts	No Active Efforts	No Active Efforts	Missing/No Opinion
Survey Item	*n*	**Mean**	*n*	**Mean**	*n*	**Mean**	*n*
Q13: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	251	2.89	357	2.87	40	2.80	140
Q14: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities through use of the integration model.	196	2.54	268	2.51	33	2.64	291
Q15: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	213	2.00	304	2.02	38	2.08	233
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	2.46	1.56	329	2.11	39	2.97	174
Q17: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	219	2.00	266	2.22	27	2.67	276
Q18: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	186	1.47	253	1.71	30	1.83	319
Q19: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	159	1.91	219	1.96	27	2.15	383
Q20: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	254	2.04	347	1.99	41	2.17	146
Q21: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	256	2.71	355	2.83	43	2.81	134

RE: Research Question 11

Table 80

Item Frequencies and Means for Q 5-21 By Q2: Middle School[1]

Survey Item	Extensive Efforts	Extensive Efforts	Some Active Efforts	Some Active Efforts	No Active Efforts	No Active Efforts	Missing/No Opinion
	n	Mean[2]	*n*	Mean	*n*	Mean	*n*
Q5: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	175	1.67	324	1.73	36	1.69	253
Q6: Equal or superior learning opportunities area available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.	173	2.03	325	2.09	36	2.08	254
Q7: Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	156	2.62	288	2.33	33	2.33	311
Q8: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	157	2.95	291	2.81	34	2.88	306
Q9: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.	165	2.21	309	2.19	36	2.19	278
Q10: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.	174	3.50	330	3.48	39	3.41	245
Q11: Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	173	2.86	337	2.91	39	2.67	239

---

[1] Group includes special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers, and LD teachers by Q1:: Elementary (*n* = 788).

[2] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend to Disagree, 4=Disagree.

Survey Item	Extensive Efforts *n*	Extensive Efforts Mean	Some Active Efforts *n*	Some Active Efforts Mean	No Active Efforts *n*	No Active Efforts Mean	Missing/No Opinion *n*
Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	174	2.61	333	2.69	39	3.18	242
Q13: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	167	2.74	310	2.85	32	2.78	279
Q14: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities through use of the integration model.	129	2.44	251	2.52	26	2.65	382
Q15: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	147	2.02	276	1.99	34	1.91	331
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	165	1.58	290	2.07	32	2.91	301
Q17: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	148	2.01	241	2.20	23	2.43	376
Q18: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	124	1.56	225	1.68	26	1.77	413
Q19: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	111	1.93	202	2.00	24	1.88	451
Q20: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	168	2.07	312	2.04	34	1.85	274
Q21: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	171	2.78	314	2.80	36	2.61	267

RE: Research Question 11

Table 81

Item Frequencies and Means for Q 5-21 By Q3: High School[1]

	Extensive Efforts	Extensive Efforts	Some Active Efforts	Some Active Efforts	No Active Efforts	No Active Efforts	Missing/No Response
Survey Items	*n*	Mean[2]	*n*	Mean	*n*	Mean	*n*
Q5: The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.	156	1.69	289	1.67	57	1.60	286
Q6: Equal or superior learning opportunities are available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.	157	2.08	289	2.03	58	1.95	284
Q7: Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.	135	2.45	261	2.37	56	2.43	336
Q8: Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.	141	2.90	262	2.77	57	2.91	328
Q9: The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.	144	2.24	278	2.13	60	210	306
Q10: Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.	155	3.48	294	3.44	62	3.47	277
Q11: Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	156	2.79	300	2.86	62	2.79	270

---

[1] Group includes special education supervisors, general education supervisors, building principals, general elementary education teachers, general secondary education teachers, and LD teachers by Q1: Middle (*n* = 788).

[2] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend to Disagree, 4=Disagree.

Survey Item	Extensive Efforts *n*	Extensive Efforts Mean	Some Active Efforts *n*	Some Active Efforts Mean	No Active Efforts *n*	No Active Efforts Mean	Missing/No Response *n*
Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	155	2.64	298	2.65	62	2.87	273
Q13: "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	144	2.72	270	2.83	53	2.79	321
Q14: Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities through use of the integration model.	116	2.48	228	2.46	45	2.38	399
Q15: Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	129	2.01	259	1.93	53	2.00	347
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	146	1.71	259	2.08	53	2.34	330
Q17: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	121	2.08	219	2.15	45	2.27	403
Q18: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	107	1.64	199	1.65	41	1.68	441
Q19: Research findings document equal or superior outcomes for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	96	1.96	193	1.97	34	1.85	465
Q20: The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.	151	2.15	280	1.98	56	1.88	301
Q21: Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	152	2.80	288	2.76	58	2.67	290

RE: Research Question 11

Table 82

Means and Standard Deviations for Significant ANOVAS for Q5-21 By Integration Group Defined By Q1[1]

Survey Item	Group	*n*	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation
Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	Extensive Active Efforts	261	2.54	0.848
	Some Active Efforts	378	2.72	0.788
	No Active Efforts	46	3.24	0.736
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	Extensive Active Efforts	246	1.56	0.73
	Some Active Efforts	329	2.11	0.845
	No Active Efforts	39	2.97	0.903
Q17: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	Extensive Active Efforts	219	2	0.818
	Some Active Efforts	266	2.22	0.842
	No Active Efforts	27	2.67	0.92
Q18: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific leaning disabilities.	Extensive Active Efforts	186	1.47	0.634
	Some Active Efforts	253	1.71	0.719
	No Active Efforts	30	1.83	0.834

---

[1] Bonferonni's inequality used to control the Type 1 error rate at 0.05 (0.05/17 or 0.00294.

[2] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend to Disagree, 4=Disagree.

RE: Research Question 11

Table 83

Means and Standard Deviations for Significant ANOVAS for Q5-21 By Integration Group Defined By Q2[1]

Survey Item	Group	*n*	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation
Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.	Extensive Active Efforts	174	2.61	0.816
	Some Active Efforts	333	2.69	0.812
	No Active Efforts	39	3.18	0.683
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	Extensive Active Efforts	165	1.58	0.742
	Some Active Efforts	290	2.07	0.868
	No Active Efforts	32	2.91	0.856

---

[1] Bonferonni's inequality used to control the Type 1 error rate at 0.05 (0.05/17 or 0.00294.

[2] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend to Disagree, 4=Disagree.

RE: Research Question 11

Table 84

Means and Standard Deviations for Significant ANOVAS for Q5-21 By Integration Group Defined By Q3[1]

Survey Item	Group	*n*	Mean[2]	Standard Deviation
Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	Extensive Active Efforts	146	1.71	0.894
	Some Active Efforts	259	2.08	0.901
	No Active Efforts	53	2.34	0.979

---

[1] Bonferonni's inequality used to control the Type 1 error rate at 0.05 (0.05/17 or 0.00294.

[2] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend to Disagree, 4=Disagree.

RE: Research Question 11

Table 85

Results ofPost Hoc Analysis for Significant ANOVAS Identifying Group Differences Corresponding with Integration Efforts Reported at Three Instructional Levels Elementary (Q1), Middle (Q2) and High School (Q3) for Q5-21: Personal Agreement [1] [2]

Elementary Level

Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.

	No Active Efforts	Some Active Efforts	Extensive Efforts
Mean[3]	3.24	2.72	2.54
n	46	378	261
	aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa		
		bbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbb	

Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.

	No Active Efforts	Some Active Efforts	Extensive Efforts
Mean	2.97	2.11	1.56
n	39	329	246
	aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa		
		bbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbb	
			cccccccccccccccccccc

---

[1] Groups include special education supervisors (SpedSup), general education supervisors (GenSup), building principals (Prin), general elementary education teachers (ElemTch), general secondary education teachers (SecTch), and LD teachers (LDTch) grouped by responses to Q1-3 regarding integration efforts.

[2] Bonferonni's inequality used to control the Type 1 error rate at 0.05 (0.05/40 or 0.00125).

[3] Scale: 1=Agree, 2=Tend to Agree, 3=Tend to Disagree, 4=Disagree.

Q17: Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific leaning disabilities.

	No Active Efforts	**Some Active Efforts**	**Extensive Efforts**
Mean	2.67	2.22	2.00
n	*27*	*266*	*219*
	aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa		
		bbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbb	

Q18: External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.

	No Active Efforts	**Some Active Efforts**	**Extensive Efforts**
Mean	1.83	1.71	1.47
n	30	253	186
	aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa		
		bbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbb	

Middle School

Q12: Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.

	No Active Efforts	**Some Active Efforts**	**Extensive Efforts**
Mean	3.18	2.69	2.61
n	39	333	174
	aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa		
		bbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbb	

Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.

	No Active Efforts	**Some Active Efforts**	**Extensive Efforts**
Mean	2.91	2.07	1.58
n	32	290	165
	aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa		
		bbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbb	
			ccccccccccccccccccccccc

High School

Q16: School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.

	No Active Efforts	**Some Active Efforts**	**Extensive Efforts**
Mean	2.34	2.08	1.71
n	53	259	146
	aaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaa		
			bbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbbb

RE: Follow-Up Interviews

Table 86

Summary of Content for Selected Items from Parent Interviews Conducted During the Follow-up Field Visits[1]

Interview Item	Comments	*n*
Q6: Classes child finds most difficult	Reading	5
	Written Expressions	4
	Content Classes	4
	Everything	1
	Math	1
	Unclear or no response	1
Q7: Classes child finds easier than others	Math	8
	Science	3
	Health	2
	Reading	1
	English	1
	Social Studies	1
	Spelling	1
	Unclear or no reasons	1
Q8: Parents' awareness of attempts to increase integration	Yes	10
	No	3
	Unsure	2
Q8a: How parents became aware of integration efforts	Teacher or IEP Conference	4
	LD teacher	3
	Parent group	1
	Unclear or no response	7
Q8b: What parents think prompted integration efforts	Students' needs	5
	Less stigma	4
	Limited staff	1
	Save assessment time	1
	Public awareness	1
	Unclear or no response	3
Q9: Parents' awareness of specific goals for integration	Improved socialization	3
	Improved academic performance	2
	Allow peer support	1
	Aware of goals (unspecified)	2
	Unaware of goals	6
	Unclear or no responses	2
Q10: Are in-school assignments being adapted?	Yes	11
	No	2
	Unclear or no response	2
Q11: Child's ability to complete in-class assignments	Yes	4
	Yes, with modifications	2
	To my knowledge/I guess so	4
	No	2
	Unclear or no response	3
Q12: Is homework is adapted?	Yes	3
	I think so	1
	Sometimes	1
	Seldom gets homework	1
	No	7

---

[1] *(n=15)*

	Unclear or no response	2

Interview Item	Comments	n
Q14: Is your child receiving the instructional support needed?	Yes	9
	Would like more	1
	I think so	2
	No	1
	Missing	2
Q16: What child says about academic work	Very positive/happy	9
	It's OK overall	1
	Negative	1
	Doesn't say	1
	I don't know	1
	Unclear or no response	3
Q18a: Feedback received: Competence in basic skills	Positive	11
	Unclear or no response	4
Q18b: Feedback received: Work habits	Good	10
	Needs improvement	3
	Nothing	1
Q18c: Ability to keep up with class	Keeps up always	6
	Most of the time	3
	Has problems	3
	Nothing said	1
	Is getting better	1
	Unclear or no response	1
Q 20: What parents envisions for child following school completion	Engineering/architecture	1
	White collar job	1
	Technical school	1
	Dairy framing	1
	College	5
	Don't know	2
	Jehovah's Witness	1
	Maintenance/sanitation/yard work	1
	Teaching	1
	No response	1
Q21: Child's expressed interests following school	Artist or policeman	2
	Trash man	1
	None expressed	1
	Race car driver or astronaut	1
	Electrician	1
	Work with computers	1
	Dairy farming	1
	Artist	1
	College	1
	Teacher	1
	Unclear or no response	4
Q24: Parents' overall opinion about integration	Very positive	3
	Positive	4
	Concerned	2
	Unclear or no response	6
Q25: Integration efforts realistic?	Yes	11
	Unclear or no response	4
Q26: Factors most important to judge success of integration	Students' attitude and success	10
	Students' self-esteem	2
	Students' socialization	2
	Students' behavior	1
	Happiness of teacher	1
	Unclear or no response	1

Q 28: Parents' comments and/or suggestions

Like to see integration county-wide	1
Integration results in lost instruction time	1
Need to be child's advocate	1
Need to support teachers	1
Need to pull students when they are young--not wait until middle school	1
Integration has helped social development	1
Try it	2
Very pleased with program	2
No response	5

Table 87

Summary of Findings From Parent Mail Survey[1]

Survey Item	n	%
Q1: What specific learning disability(ies) does your child have?		
Oral Expression	13	
Listening Comprehension	11	
Reading	21	
Written Expression	20	
Mathematics	14	
Other	11	
Q2: What is your child's current grade of enrollment?		
Second Grade	1	3.6
Third Grade	1	3.6
Fourth Grade	4	14.3
Fifth Grade	4	14.3
Sixth Grade	7	25.0
Seventh Grade	3	10.7
Eighth Grade	1	3.6
Ninth Grade	2	7.1
Tenth Grade	–	–
Eleventh Grade	5	19.9
Twelfth Grade	–	–
Missing	1	
Q3: What is your relationship to this child?		
Mother	28	96.6
Father	1	3.4
Grandparent	–	
Other	–	
Missing	–	

---

[1] n = 29

Survey Item	n	%
Q4: Which of the following best describes your child's educational placement this year?		
Full-time integration in the regular class [i.e., **all** instruction delivered by the regular classroom teacher(s)]	5	17.2
Full-time integration in the regular class with instruction delivered by **both** the regular classroom teacher and the learning disabilities teacher within the regular classroom	2	6.9
Integration in the regular class with LD services provided in another setting such as the resource room for **less than half** the school day delivered by both the regular classroom teacher and the LD teacher within the regular classroom.	7	24.1
Part-time integration with half-day or more in a separate LD classroom (such as self-contained placement)	15	51.7
Can't Judge	--	
Missing	--	
Q5: How many, if any hours per week does your child normally spend with the LD teacher?		
No direct time with LD teacher	5	17.2
Less than 1 hour	1	3.4
1-3 hours	5	17.2
4-5 hours	4	13.8
6-10 hours	19	34.5
More than 10 hours	--	--
Can't Judge	1	3.4
Missing	--	
Q6: To what extent do you think your child's school is attempting to increase the amount of time your child spend in regular classrooms?		
Extensive Efforts	9	34.6
Some Efforts	9	34.6
No Efforts	6	23.1
Can't Judge	1	3.8
Missing	--	

Q7: Based on your judgment of your child's special learning needs, what type of educational placement option do you prefer?	*n*	%
Full-time integration in the regular class {i.e., **all** instruction delivered by the regular classroom teacher(s)]	3	10.3
Full-time integration in the regular class with instruction delivered by **both** the regular classroom teacher and the learning disabilities teacher within the regular classroom	6	20.7
Integration in the regular class with LD services provided in another setting such as the resource room for **less than half** the school day	5	17.2
Part-time integration in the regular class with **half-day or more** placement in a separate learning disabilities classroom (such as a self-contained placement)	14	48.3
Can't Judge	1	3.4

Survey Items	n	Mean[2]	Almost Always	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	Don' Know	Missing Reposes
	n					%	%	n
Q21: Are your child's *in-school* assignments being adjusted to accommodate for his/her individual needs?	28	1.86	39.3	42.9	10.7	7.1	–	1
Q22: Are your child's *homework* assignments being adjusted to accommodate for his/her individual needs?	28	2.25	32.1	28.6	21.4	17.9	–	1
Q23: To what extent is your child able to complete his/her homework assignments alone?	28	2.36	17.9	42.9	25.0	14.3	–	1
Q24: Who does your child generally go to for help with his/her homework?								
Mother	17	60.7						
Father	–	–						
Other family member	–	–						
Friend	–	–						
Other	6	21.4						
A combination of the above	4	14.3						
Can't Judge	1	3.6						
Missing	–							

---

[2] Scale: Almost Always=1, Sometimes=2, Seldom=3, Never=4.

Survey Item	*n*	Mean[3]	Well Prepared %	Somewhat Prepared %	Unprepared %	Can't Judge %	Missing Responses %
Q25: Given your child's learning disability and the education services being provided, to what extent do you think he/she will be prepared for independent living and employment?	27	1.95	18.5	40.7	14.8	25.9	2

---

[3] Scale: 1=Well Prepared, 2=Somewhat Prepared, 3=Unprepared.

Table 88

Reasons for Local Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (From Part II: Parent Mail Survey)

Decrease special education costs (n = 7)
Provide best program for students (n = 3)
Provide students with chance to be be mainstreamed (n = 3)
Encouragement from school administrators (n = 1)
Encouragement from LD teacher (n = 1)
Respond to current trend and recommendations from state (n = 1)
Help students become more self-sufficient (n = 1)
Increase students' confidence within peer group (n = 1)

Note: Summary based on content analysis of reasons given by 19 respondents.

Table 89

Obstacle for Increased Use of the Integration Effort for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (From Part II: Parent Mail Survey)

Insufficient preparation of teachers and other staff (n = 9)
Overcrowded regular classrooms (n = 5)
Students' inability to keep with in regular classroom (n = 3)
Insufficient number of qualified LD teachers (n = 2)
Insufficient resources to support regular class placement (n = 2)
Varying levels of students' needs require placement options (n = 2)
Non-disabled students lack preparation to generate acceptance of differences (n = 2)
Lack of parent involvement (n = 1)
Difficulty adjusting class assignments (n = 1)
Decisions made at administrative level (n = 1)
Unsympathetic classroom teachers (n = 1)
Overcrowded LD classes (n = 1)
Difficulty in scheduling support personnel (n = 1)
Insufficient funds (n = 1)
LD teachers' time given to non-disabled students (n = 1)
LD students slow down regular class and pace of non-disabled students

Note: Summary base on content analysis of obstacles cited by 19 parents.

Table 90

Reasons For No Active Efforts to Increase Use of the Integration Model for Serving Students with Specific Learning Disabilities (From Part II: Parent Mail Survey)

Lack of sufficient manpower or finances (n = 3)
Lack of administrative support (n = 2)
Lack of parent involvement/advocacy (n = 2)
Overburdened classroom teachers/crowded classrooms (n = 2)
Lack of understanding (n = 2)
Desire to maintain "Middle of the Road" approach (n = 1)
Resistance from regular education teachers (n = 1)
Concern regarding efficacy of total integration (n = 1)
Poor public support (n = 1)

Note: Reasons cited by 11 parents for no active efforts to increase integration.

Table 91

Parents' Concerns Related to Increased Integration Efforts (From Part II: Parent Mail Survey)

Question of whether child is really getting a good education or will fall through the crack (n = 4)
Concerns regarding child's social acceptance (n = 3)
Teachers not sufficiently prepared (n = 2)
Fear that child's support network will be lost (n = 2)
Transition to new school(n = 2)
Concern for child's comfort and acceptance of learning disability (n = 1)
Concern regarding whether child will be able to get a good job and be self-supporting (n = 1)
Poor quality of LD teacher (n = 1)
Lack of reading instruction for dyslexic child (n = 1)
Need for better home/school communication (n = 1)
Concern for students who do not have a strong advocate (n = 1)
Insufficient coordination of regular and special education teacher (n = 1)
Yearly uncertainty regarding child's program (n = 1)
Child's need for smaller/quieter class (n = 1)

Note: Concerns based on content analysis of comments from 18 parents.

Status of Special / Regular Education Integration Initiative For Students with Specific Learning Disabilities Survey

Pretest Respondent Questionnaire

Thank you for participating in the pretest administration of the Status of Special/Regular Education Integration Initiative for Students with Specific learning Disabilities Survey. A follow-up discussion will focus on the questions listed below. These questions were framed to elicit your reactions, concerns, and suggestions for improving the survey instrument. Please be open and honest with your feedback. We welcome all your comments (both negative and positive).

RE: The Cover Letter

____ 1. Were the directions clear and easy to follow?

____ 2. Was the cover letter understandable?

____ 3. Was any of the vocabulary in the cover letter or survey ambiguous or confusing? (If so, circle the confusing/ambiguous words or phrases.)

____ 4. Did the cover letter motivate your to participate in the research?

____ 5. Were terms familiar to you? (e.g., Special Education / Regular Education Integration Initiative)

____ 6. Was it clear that the survey focused on students with specific learning disabilities?

Pretest Respondent Questionnaire

RE: The Instrument

____ 7. Were any of the items unclear?

____ 8. Were any of the items offensive?

____ 9. Were the choices sufficient enough for you to record your view?

____ 10. How long did it take you to complete the survey?

____ 11. Do you feel the length of the survey was reasonable given your time constraints?

____ 12. Apart from the cover letter, what other factors would motivate you to respond to the survey?

____ 13. Would findings from this study be helpful to you in your present position?

____ 14. Did you perceive any of the items to be biased?

____ 15. Were any of the items difficult to answer or did you leave any blank?

____ 16. Was the opscan format easy to use?

____ 17. Was the appearance of the survey appealing and neat?

Virginia
Tech
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
AND STATE UNIVERSITY

College of Education

Curriculum & Instruction
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
(703) 231-5269

November 22, 1991

I am requesting your assistance in a statewide research project being conducted at Virginia Tech through funding from the US Department of Education. Through this multi-stage investigation, we seek to provide professionals working in the field with information on the current status of any program delivery changes related to what has been called the *special education/regular education integration initiative* (henceforth referred to as the *integration)* model. This initiative is designed **to increase the amount of time students with learning disabilities (and other disabilities) spend in regular classrooms beyond current practice and minimize pull-out programming**. In this study we are limiting our focus to the integration efforts for students with learning disabilities. We seek to:

1. document the extent that various factors may serve as the basis for *active efforts to increase* the integration of students with specific learning disabilities,
2. document professionals' personal agreement with these factors, and
3. determine the perceived level of support for expanded implementation of an *integrated* model for students with learning disabilities as well as anticipated benefits and obstacles.

The research protocol calls for the solicitation of views of educators, parents, and students.

You are in a position to know of any *active* efforts to increase the integration of students with learning disabilities into regular education classes within your school division and the factors that are influencing such efforts. We solicit your perceptions via the enclosed survey as the initial step in this investigation.

You may notice that the survey materials are coded. However, please be assured that your responses will not be reported individually or linked with your school division at any time. We need your honest and straightforward opinions and want you to feel completely comfortable in disclosing your views. Be assured that we are not promoting any particular position related to this issue. Please return the survey by December 13 in the enclosed envelop making sure that the Opscan form is folded as received.

Thank you for considering this request to participate in this study. Please call if you have any questions. As a gesture of thanks, we would be more than happy to share our results at the end of the investigation.

Sincerely,

Cherry K. Houck
Professor of Education

Encl: Survey Materials

Virginia Tech
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
AND STATE UNIVERSITY

College of Education

Curriculum & Instruction
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
(703) 231-5269

January 9,1992

Ms.
Supervisor of Special Education

Dear Ms.

Bad Timing?? In December we sent you an inquiry regarding the status of Special/Regular Education integration efforts for students with specific learning disabilities. No doubt the holidays were a busy time for everyone and perhaps not a very good time to ask for your participation in this research. Since we are very anxious to develop an accurate portrait of supervisors' opinions related to the integration issue for students with specific learning disabilities and to report any programming changes in response to this initiative, your views are very important.

If you have mailed your response, please disregard this follow-up request. If not, could you spend a few minutes completing the enclosed survey? Your time and efforts would be greatly appreciated. Thank you for considering this request and best wishes for the New Year!

Sincerely,

Cherry K. Houck
Professor of Education

Encl: Survey Materials

360

Commonwealth Is Our Campus
An Equal Opportunity / Affirmative Action Institution

Virginia Tech
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
AND STATE UNIVERSITY

College of Education

Curriculum & Instruction
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
(703) 231-5269

December 13, 1991

Ms.

Dear Ms.

We need your help! Several weeks ago you received an inquiry regarding the status of Special/Regular Education integration efforts for students with specific learning disabilities. In checking our records, we see that your survey form has not been received to date. If you have mailed your response, please disregard this follow-up request. If not, could you spend a few minutes completing the enclosed survey? Your time and efforts would be greatly appreciated. Thank you for considering this request.

Happy Holidays,

Cherry Houck

Cherry K. Houck
Professor of Education

Encl: Survey Materials

Scanner Forms 18-2297-54321

VIRGINIA TECH

PART I. Status of Special/Regular Education Integration Initiative for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities

Your responses to this survey are requested to help in a status study of the special/regular education integration initiative for students with specific learning disabilities. Please use a **NO. 2 PENCIL** to mark your responses in the answer column. Be sure to match the item number with the number in the answer column.

(1-3) To what extent do you think your school division is actively attempting to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in regular classrooms beyond recent practices? *Use the following scale to respond.*

1) Extensive Active Efforts **2) Some Active Efforts** **3) No Active Efforts**
10) No Opinion

1. At the elementary level
2. At the middle school level
3. At the high school level

4. Has your school division adopted any guidelines, written philosophies, or policies which are specifically designed to increase the time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular classroom? *Use the following scale to respond.*

1) Yes **2) No** **10) Can't Judge**

(5-21) To what extent do you personally agree with the following statements regarding the special education/regular education integration initiative? *Use the following scale to respond.*

1) Agree **2) Tend to Agree** **3) Tend to Disagree**
4) Disagree **10) No Opinion**

5. The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.
6. Equal or superior learning opportunities are available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.
7. Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.
8. Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.
9. The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.
10. Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.
11. Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.
12. Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.
13. "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.
14. Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities through use of the integration model.
15. Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.
16. School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
17. Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
18. External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
19. Research findings document equal or superior outcome for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.
20. The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.
21. Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.

(22-34) Based on your knowledge, please indicate which, if any, of the following data on students with specific learning disabilities and related administrative data are being systematically collected and summarized on a school- or system-wide basis. *Use the following scale to respond.*

1) Data Being Collected for LD **2) Data Being Collected (Not by Category)**
3) Data Not Being Collected **10) Can't Judge**

22. standardized measures of academic achievement
23. absenteeism
24. grade retention
25. dropout rate(s)
26. rate of diplomas granted
27. students' attitudes toward learning and school
28. grades for each grading period
29. students' satisfaction in school placement

07201071

— OVER PLEASE — Begin with item 30

USE NO. 2 PENCIL ONLY

1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
9	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
10	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
12	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
13	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
14	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
15	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
16	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
17	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
18	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
19	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
20	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
21	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
22	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
23	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
24	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
25	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
26	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
27	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
28	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
29	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

A ● 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 B 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 ● 8 9 C 0 ● 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Please continue using the following scale to respond

1) Data Being Collected for LD **2) Data Being Collected (Not by Category)**
3) Data Not Being Collected **10) Can't Judge**

30. social acceptance within the regular education settings
31. parental satisfaction with the educational program provided for their LD student.
32. number of referrals for special education services
33. the number of students with learning disabilities in each program delivery option each school year.
34. educational costs in the delivery of special education services for students with specific learning disabilities

Answer items 35 to 57 only if your system is actively attempting to increase the integration of students with specific learning disabilities in the regular classroom.

(35-51) To what extent do you believe the following statements serve as the basis for any current policy or programmatic changes within your school division to increase use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities? *Use the following scale to respond.*

1) To a Great Extent **2) To Some Extent** **3) To Only a Limited Extent**
4) To No Extent **10) No Opinion**

35. The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.
36. Students with specific learning disabilities have equal or superior learning opportunities when the integration model is used.
37. Educational costs are reduced through use of the integration model.
38. The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.
39. Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.
40. Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.
41. Regular/general educators are able to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.
42. Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.
43. "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.
44. Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities through the use of the integration model.
45. Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.
46. School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
47. Local parents have encouraged use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
48. External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
49. Research findings document equal or superior outcome for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.
50. The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities among special and regular education personnel.
51. Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.

(52-57) To what extent do you think the following factors are/have been present within your school division during efforts to increase the use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities? *Use the following scale to respond.*

1) Clearly Present **2) Present to Some Extent**
3) Not Present **10) Can't Judge**

52. Involvement of key stakeholders (i.e., central administrators, supervisors, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementation of integration efforts.
53. Establishment of realistic goals for integration.
54. Clear articulation of goals for integration.
55. Flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual schools due to the presence of the unique school characteristics.
56. Access to necessary resources and support for integration.
57. A systematic process for evaluating the process and outcome of the integration effort.

– PLEASE CONTINUE TO PART II –

30 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
31 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
32 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
33 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
34 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
35 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
36 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
37 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
38 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
39 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
40 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
41 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
42 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
43 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
44 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
45 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
46 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
47 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
48 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
49 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
50 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
51 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
52 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
53 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
54 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
55 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
56 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
57 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
58 ● 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
59 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
60 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART II. Status of Special/Regular Education Integration Initiative for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities

58 If your school division is actively seeking to implement the integration model to serve students with specific learning disabilities (and perhaps students with other disabilities), what do you consider to be the **primary or basic reason(s)** for this active effort?

59 If your school division is not seeking to implement the integration model, what do you consider to be the **primary reason(s)**?

60 In the space provided, please identify what you consider to be **major obstacle(s)** to implementation of the integration model for serving students with specific learning disabilities within your school division.

Respondent Information

61 Name (optional) ____________________

62 Job Title ____________________

63 Number of Years in Current Position: __________

64 Certifications, Endorsements, or Liscensures Held (Check/identify those you hold.)

☐ Early Education (NK-3)
☐ Elementary Education (3-6)
☐ Secondary Education (specify subject area(s)) ____________________
☐ Learning Disabilities
☐ School Psychologist
☐ Instructional and Supervisory Personnel
☐ School Principal
☐ Other(s) (Please specify) ____________________

– OVER PLEASE –

65 Would you be willing to send a copy of any enabling guidelines, philosophies and/or policies *designed to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular education program?* (Please let us know if there is a charge for obtaining such documents.)

☐ Yes (Copies of relevant documents are included with my response.)
☐ Yes (Copies of relevant documents will be sent in a separate mailing.)
☐ Please phone me at ______________________ to obtain copies of relevant documents.
☐ I am unable to provide copies of the relevant documents

66 Would you like a summary of the research findings?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Preferred mailing address:

____

____

____

Please return the completed survey in the pre-addressed, postage-paid envelope. Send any non-supplied envelopes to the following address:

Dr. Cherry Houck
319 War Memorial Hall
College of Education
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061-0313

If you have any questions, please phone (703) 231-5269.

Thank you for your participation in this research.

Virginia Tech
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
AND STATE UNIVERSITY

College of Education

Curriculum & Instruction
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
(703) 231-5269

February 5, 1992

Dear

I am writing to request your assistance in a statewide research project being conducted at Virginia Tech through funding from the US Department of Education. Through this multi-stage investigation, we seek to provide professionals working in the field with information on the current status of any program delivery changes related to what has been called the *special education/regular education integration initiative* (or *integration*) model. As you may know this initiative is designed to *increase the amount of time students with learning disabilities (and other disabilities) spend in regular classrooms beyond current practice while minimizing pull-out programming*. In this particular study we are limiting our focus to integration efforts for students with specific learning disabilities.

Your name was randomly selected as one who could represent professionals employed in a position such as yours. Through your work, you are in a position to know of any *active* efforts to increase the integration of students with learning disabilities into regular education classes within your school division and the factors that are influencing such efforts. We solicit your perceptions via the enclosed survey as part of this investigation.

You may notice that the survey materials are coded. However, please be assured that your responses will not be reported individually or linked with your school division at any time. We need your honest and straightforward opinions and want you to feel completely comfortable in disclosing your views. *Also, be assured that we are not promoting any particular position related to this issue.* If possible, we ask that you return the completed survey with the next two weeks in the enclosed envelop making sure that the Opscan form is folded as received.

Thank you for considering this request to participate in this study as a representative for other professionals in your position. Please know that I truly appreciate the time you will give to this effort. If you have any questions or would like to have additional information about this research, please do not hesitate to call me or Mrs. Sandra Dill, *Research Assistant* at (703) 231-5269).

Sincerely,

Cherry K. Houck
Professor of Education

Encl: Survey Materials

A Land-Grant University–The Commonwealth Is Our Campus
An Equal Opportunity / Affirmative Action Institution

Virginia
Tech
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
AND STATE UNIVERSITY

College of Education

Curriculum & Instruction
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
(703) 231-5269

March 3, 1992

DEAR

We need your help! Several weeks ago you received an inquiry regarding the status of Special/Regular Education integration efforts for students with specific learning disabilities. Based on the responses to date, professionals appear to hold very different views regarding expanded integration initiatives and we want to be sure that our findings accurately reflect the views of the key *stakeholders* in such program change.

In checking our records, we see that your survey form has not been returned. If you have mailed your response, please disregard this follow-up request. If not, could you spend a few minutes completing the enclosed survey?

I wish I could compensate you for giving your valuable time and expertise to this research. Please know that you have my sincere thanks for considering this request.

Sincerely,

Cherry Houck

Cherry K. Houck
Professor of Education

Encl: Survey Materials

A Land-Grant University–The Commonwealth Is Our Campus
An Equal Opportunity / Affirmative Action Institution

Virginia Tech
VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE
AND STATE UNIVERSITY

College of Education

Curriculum & Instruction
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
(703) 231-5269

April 30, 1992

DEAR MS. ,

Bad Timing?? Earlier we sent you an inquiry regarding the status of Special/Regular Education integration efforts for students with specific learning disabilities. No doubt the past few months have been a busy time for everyone and perhaps not a very good time to ask for your participation in this research. Since we are very anxious to develop an accurate portrait of professionals' opinions related to the integration issue for students with specific learning disabilities and to report any programming changes in response to this initiative, your views are very important. Due to the random selection of individuals within specific professional positions, we look to you as as spokesperson for others employed as LD teachers. **Whatever your views, we want to know what you think!**

If you have mailed your response, please disregard this follow-up request. If not, could you give us your time to complete the enclosed survey? Your input would be greatly appreciated.

As I mentioned in my earlier letter, I wish there was some way we could compensate you for giving your valuable time and expertise to this research. As a small gesture, if you would like to receive a summary of our findings, please indicate your name and preferred mailing address on Part II of your completed survey form.

Sincerely,

Cherry K. Houck

Cherry K. Houck
Professor of Education

Encl: Survey Materials

A Land-Grant University–The Commonwealth Is Our Campus
An Equal Opportunity / Affirmative Action Institution

VIRGINIA TECH

PART I. Status of Special/Regular Education Integration Initiative for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities

Your responses to this survey are requested to help in a status study of the special/regular education integration initiative for students with specific learning disabilities. Please use a **NO. 2 PENCIL** to mark your responses in the answer column. Be sure to match the item number with the number in the answer column.

(1-3) To what extent do you think your school or school division is actively attempting to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in regular classrooms beyond recent practices? *Use the following scale to respond.*

1) Extensive Active Efforts **2) Some Active Efforts** **3) No Active Efforts**
10) No Opinion

1. At the elementary level
2. At the middle school level
3. At the high school level
4. Has your school or school division adopted any guidelines, written philosophies, or policies which are specifically designed to increase the time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular classroom? *Use the following scale to respond.*
   1) Yes **2) No** **10) Can't Judge**

(5-21) To what extent do you personally agree with the following statements regarding the special education/regular education integration initiative? *Use the following scale to respond.*

1) Agree **2) Tend to Agree** **3) Tend to Disagree**
4) Disagree **10) No Opinion**

5. The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.
6. Equal or superior learning opportunities are available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.
7. Special education costs are reduced through use of the integration model.
8. Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.
9. The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.
10. Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.
11. Regular/general educators have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.
12. Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.
13. "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.
14. Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities through use of the integration model.
15. Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.
16. School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
17. Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
18. External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
19. Research findings document equal or superior outcome for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.
20. The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between special and regular education personnel.
21. Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.

Answer items 22 to 57 only if your school or school division is actively attempting to increase the integration of students with specific learning disabilities in the regular classroom. Otherwise, please skip to Part II.

(22-38) To what extent do you believe the following statements serve as the basis for any current policy or programmatic changes within your school or school division to increase use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities? *Use the following scale to respond.*

1) To a Great Extent **2) To Some Extent** **3) To Only a Limited Extent**
4) To No Extent **10) No Opinion**

22. The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.
23. Students with specific learning disabilities have equal or superior learning opportunities when the integration model is used.
24. Educational costs are reduced through use of the integration model.
25. The utilization of learning disabilities personnel is improved (e.g., number of students served, more time for direct instruction and collaborative consultation) through use of the integration model.
26. Referrals and time-consuming assessments are reduced through use of the integration model.
27. Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.
28. Regular/general educators are able to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.
29. Regular/general educators are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.

— OVER PLEASE — Begin with item 30.

1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
2	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
3	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
4	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
5	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
6	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
9	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
11	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
12	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
14	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
15	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
16	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
17	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
18	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
19	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
20	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
21	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
23	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
24	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
25	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
26	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
27	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
28	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
29	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

A	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	B	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	C	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Please continue using the following scale to respond.

1) To a Great Extent **2) To Some Extent** **3) To Only a Limited Extent**
4) To No Extent **10) No Opinion**

30. "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.
31. Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities through the use of the integration model.
32. Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.
33. School administrators/supervisors have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
34. Local parents have encouraged use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
35. External consultants and/or experts have recommended use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.
36. Research findings document equal or superior outcome for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.
37. The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities among special and regular education personnel.
38. Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.

(39-44) To what extent do you think the following factors are/have been present within your school or school division during efforts to increase the use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities? *Use the following scale to respond.*

1) Clearly Present **2) Present to Some Extent**
3) Not Present **10) Can't Judge**

39. Involvement of key stakeholders (i.e., central administrators, supervisors, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementation of integration efforts.
40. Establishment of realistic goals for integration.
41. Clear articulation of goals for integration.
42. Flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual schools due to the presence of the unique school characteristics.
43. Access to necessary resources and support for integration.
44. A systematic process for evaluating the process and outcome of the integration effort.

(45-57) Based on your observations, please indicate which, if any, changes you have noted related to the following outcome measues for students with specific learning disabilities that you attribute to your school or school division's integration efforts during the 1991-92 school year. *Use the following scale to respond.*

1) Positive Change **2) No Change**
3) Negative Change **10) Can't Judge**

45. Standardized measures of LD students' academic achievement
46. LD students' grades for each grading period
47. LD students' attitudes toward learning and school
48. LD students' satisfaction in school placement
49. LD students' social acceptance within the regular education settings
50. Parental satisfaction with the educational program provided for their child with a learning disability
51. Absenteeism for LD students
52. Anticipated grade promotion rate for LD students
53. Dropout rate(s) for LD students
54. Anticipated rate of diplomas granted to LD students
55. Number of referrals for special education services
56. The availabilty of appopriate education services for LD students
57. Cost efficiency in the delivery of services for LD students

– PLEASE CONTINUE TO PART II –

[illegible]

30 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
31 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
32 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
33 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
34 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
35 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
36 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
37 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
38 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
39 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
40 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
41 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
42 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
43 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
44 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
45 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
46 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
47 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
48 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
49 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
50 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
51 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
52 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
53 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
54 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
55 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
56 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
57 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
58 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
59 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩
60 ① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ⑥ ⑦ ⑧ ⑨ ⑩

PART II. Status of Special/Regular Education Integration Initiative for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities

58. If your school or school division is actively seeking to implement the integration model to serve students with specific learning disabilities, what do you consider to be the **primary or basic reason(s)** for this active effort?

59. If your school or school division is not seeking to implement the integration model, what do you consider to be the **primary reason(s)**?

60. In the space provided, please identify what you consider to be **major obstacle(s)** to implementation of the integration model for serving students with specific learning disabilities within your school or school division.

Respondent Information

61. Name (optional): ____________________

62. Job Title: ____________________

63. Number of Years in Current Position: __________

64. Certifications, Endorsements, or Liscensures Held (Check/identify those you hold.)

- ☐ Early Education (NK-3)
- ☐ Elementary Education (3-8)
- ☐ Secondary Education (specify subject area(s)) ____________________
- ☐ Learning Disabilities
- ☐ School Psychologist
- ☐ Instructional and Supervisory Personnel
- ☐ School Principal
- ☐ Other(s) (Please specify) ____________________

– OVER PLEASE

65 If you are a building principal or a teacher would you be willing to send a copy of any enabling guidelines, philosophies, and/or policies *designed by your school to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular education program?* (Please let us know if there is a charge for obtaining such documents.)

- ☐ Yes (Copies of relevant documents are included with my response.)
- ☐ Yes (Copies of relevant documents will be sent in a separate mailing.)
- ☐ Please phone me at ______________________ to obtain copies of relevant documents.
- ☐ I am unable to provide copies of the relevant documents.

Please return the completed survey in the pre-addressed, postage-paid envelope. Send any non-supplied envelopes to the following address:

Dr. Cherry Houck
319 War Memorial Hall
College of Education
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061-0313

If you have any questions, please phone (703) 231-5269.

Thank you for your participation in this research.

VIRGINIA TECH UNIVERSITY

SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITIES PROJECT
STATUS OF INTEGRATION EFFORTS

PARENT SURVEY: SPECIAL/REGULAR EDUCATION INTEGRATION INITIATIVE FOR STUDENTS WITH SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITIES

PRETEST RESPONDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Thank you for meeting with me today and completing the survey. During this followup session, I am going to ask you some questions about the cover letter, the questions, and the survey form itself. The goal of this discussion is to get your reactions, concerns, and suggestions for improving the survey. Please be open and honest with your feedback. We welcome all your comments (both negative and positive).

These questions are about the cover letter.

_____1. Could you read the cover letter without much difficulty?

_____2. Did you understand it?

_____3. Was any of the vocabulary in the cover letter confusing? (If so, circle the confusing parts).

_____4. Did the cover letter make you want to fill out the survey? What, if any changes are needed to make parents more willing to complete the survey?

_____5 . Were the terms familiar to you? (e.g., Special Education\Regular Education Integration Initiative).

_____6. Was it clear that the survey was about students with specific learning disabilities?

PRETEST PARENT RESPONDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

These questions are about the survey.

_____7. Were any of the questions unclear to you?

_____8. Did any of the questions offend you?

_____9. Were the choices listed after each question adequate for you to answer the questions? (Did they say what you meant them to say?)

_____10. How long did it take you to complete the survey?

_____11. Do you feel the length of the survey was reasonable?

_____12 . Apart from the cover letter, what other things would make you want to complete the survey?

______13. Did you think any of the items were slanted or prejudiced?

_____14. Were any of the items difficult to answer or did you leave any blank?

_____15. Were you able to use the form easily? (For example, were you able to read the question and fill in the bubbles without any trouble?)

_____16. Was the survey neat looking and did it appeal to you?

______17. Were there any important questions you think we should have asked?

VIRGINIA TECH

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DIVISION OF CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION

BLACKSBURG, VIRGINIA 24061-0313
(703) 231-5347

Spring, 1992

Dear Parent:

I am writing to ask for your help with a research project being conducted at Virginia Tech. We are interested in learning more about any recent program changes to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular classrooms. Such changes are sometimes referred to as the Special/Regular Education Integration Model.

We are asking you to share your views regarding any changes you have noted in the amount of time your child is spending in the regular classroom as a result of increased integration efforts. Your ideas and opinions are very important to us.

Will you help us by completing the enclosed survey and sending it back to us in the self-addressed, stamped envelop? Your responses will be combined with those of other parents to form an overall report of parents' views. At no time will your name or individual responses be shared with anyone.

Please do not hesitate to call me or Ms. Sandra Dill, Research Assistant, at (703) 231-5269 if you have any questions. We hope you will agree to participate and that you will feel free to express your honest opinions.

Sincerely,

Cherry Houck

Cherry K. Houck
Professor of Education

Enclosure: Survey Materials

PART I. Status of Special/Regular Education Integration Initiative for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities: Parent Survey

Your responses to this survey are requested to help in a study investigating recent efforts to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular classroom. This practice is often referred to as the special/regular education integration initiative or "integration model." Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability.

1. **What specific learning disability(ies) does your child have? Check all that apply.**

☐1) Oral Expression ☐2) Listening Comprehension ☐3) Reading ☐4) Written Expression ☐5) Mathematics
☐6) Other (Please specify ______________________) ☐10) Can't judge

2. **What is your child's current grade of enrollment?** ______________

3. **What is your relationship to this child?**

☐1) Mother ☐2) Father ☐3) Grandparent ☐4) Other (Please specify______________)

4. **Which of the following best describes your child's educational placement this year?**

☐1) Full-time integration in the regular class [i.e., *all* instruction delivered by the regular classroom teacher(s)]
☐2) Full-time integration in the regular class with instruction delivered by *both* the regular classroom teacher and the learning disabilities teacher within the regular classroom
☐3) Integration in the regular class with LD services provided in another setting such as the resource room for *less than half* of the school day
☐4) Part-time integration in the regular class with *half-day or more* placement in a separate learning disabilities classroom (such as self-contained placement)
☐10) Can't judge

5. **Check how many, if any, hours per week your child normally spends with the learning disabilities teacher.**

☐1) No direct time spent with the L.D. teacher ☐2) less than 1 hour ☐3) 1 to 3 hours
☐4) 4 to 5 hours ☐5) 6 to 10 hours ☐6) More than 10 hours ☐10) Can't Judge

6. **To what extent do you think your child's school is attempting *to increase* the amount of time your child spends in regular classrooms? Use the answers below.**

☐1) Extensive Efforts ☐2) Some Efforts ☐3) No Efforts ☐10) Can't Judge

7. **Based on your judgement of your child's special learning needs, what type of educational placement option do you prefer? Check one of the following placement options.**

☐1) Full-time integration in the regular class [i.e., *all* instruction delivered by the regular class teacher(s)]
☐2) Full-time integration in the regular class with instruction delivered by *both* the regular teacher and the learning disabilities teacher within the regular classroom
☐3) Integration in the regular class with LD services provided in another setting such as the resource room for ***less than half*** of the school day
☐4) Part-time integration in the regular class with ***half-day or more*** placement in a separate learning disabilities classroom (such as self-contained placement)
☐10) Can't judge

(8-20) Please indicate to what extent you **personally agree** with the following statements regarding the special education/regular education integration initiative by **circling the number at the end of the question that corresponds with your opinion.**

	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion
8. **The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.**	1	2	3	4	10
9. **Equal or superior learning opportunities are available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.**	1	2	3	4	10
10. **Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-handicapped peers.**	1	2	3	4	10
11. **Regular classroom teachers have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.**	1	2	3	4	10
12. **Regular classroom teachers are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.**	1	2	3	4	10

	Agree	Tend to Agree	Tend to Disagree	Disagree	No Opinion
13. "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.	1	2	3	4	10
14. Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities through use of the integration model.	1	2	3	4	10
15. Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.	1	2	3	4	10
16. School administrators/supervisors and/or experts have encouraged implementation of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1	2	3	4	10
17. Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.	1	2	3	4	10
18. Research findings document equal or superior outcome for students with specific learning disabilities who are served in the integration model.	1	2	3	4	10
19. The integration model results in a genuine sharing of instructional responsibilities between LD teachers and regular classroom teachers and other school personnel.	1	2	3	4	10
20. Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.	1	2	3	4	10

(21-25) Please use the following responses to answer items 21-25. **Circle the number at the end of the question that corresponds with your answer.**

	Almost Always	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	Don't Know
21. **Are your child's *in-school* assignments being adjusted to accommodate for his/her individual needs?**	1	2	3	4	10
22. **Are your child's *homework* assignments being adjusted to accommodate for his/her individual needs?**	1	2	3	4	10
23. **To what extent is your child able to complete his/her homework assignments alone?**	1	2	3	4	10

24. **Who does your child generally go to for help with his/her homework? Check your answer below.**

☐1) Mother ☐2) Father ☐3) Other Family Member ☐4) Friend
☐5) Other (specify ________________________) ☐10) Can't judge

25. **Given your child's learning disability and the educational services being provided, to what extent do you think he/she will be prepared for independent living and employment? Please check the answer that coresonds with your opinion.**

☐1) Well prepared ☐2) Somewhat prepared ☐3) Unprepared ☐10) Can't Judge

Answer items 26-41 only if you think your child's school is attempting *to increase* the time your child is spending in the regular classroom. Otherwise, please skip to Part II.

(26-35) Based on your observations, please indicate **which, if any,** changes you have noted as a result of the increased time your child is spending in the regular classroom during the 1991-92 school year. **Circle the number at the end of the question that corresponds with your opinion.**

	Positive Change	No Change	Negative Change	Can't Judge
26. **Standardized test measures of your child's academic achievement**	1	2	3	10
27. **Your child's grades for each grading period**	1	2	3	10
28. **Your child's attitude toward learning and school**	1	2	3	10
29. **Your child's satisfaction in his or her school placement**	1	2	3	10
30. **Your child's social acceptance within the regular classroom(s)**	1	2	3	10
31. **Your satisfaction with the educational program provided for your child**	1	2	3	10
32. **Your child's school attendance**	1	2	3	10
33. **Your child's prospects for promotion this year**	1	2	3	10
34. **Your child's prospects for completing high school**	1	2	3	10
35. **The availability of appropriate education services for your child**	1	2	3	10

(36-41) To what extent do you think the following factors **are/have been** present within your child's school or school division during efforts to increase the use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities? **Circle the number at the end of the question that corresponds with your answer.**

	Clearly Present	Present to Some Extent	Not Present	Can't Judge
36. **Involvement of key stakeholders (i.e., central administrators, supervisors, principals, teachers, parents, students) in planning and implementation of integration efforts.**	1	2	3	10
37. **Establishment of realistic goals for integration.**	1	2	3	10
38. **Clear articulation of goals for integration.**	1	2	3	10
39. **Flexibility in planning and implementing integrative efforts in individual schools due to the presence of the unique school characteristics.**	1	2	3	10
40. **Access to necessary resources and support for integration.**	1	2	3	10
41. **A systematic method for evaluating the process and outcome of the integration effort.**	1	2	3	10

▶GO TO PART II AND THEN ...

Please use the provided pre-addressed, postage-paid, envelope and return your completed survey. If you have any questions or comments, please contact:

Dr. Cherry K. Houck
SLD Research Project
College of Education
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0313
(703) 231-5269

Thank you for responding to this survey!

356

357

PART II. Status of Special/Regular Education Integration Initiative for Students with Learning Disabilities: Parent Survey

Use reverse side, if needed. Remember your individual responses will remain confidential.

42. If your child's school is actively seeking to implement the integration model to serve students with specific learning disabilities, what do you consider to be the **primary or basic reason(s)** for this active effort?

43. If your child's school is not seeking to implement the integration model, what do you consider to be the **primary reason(s)**?

44. In the space provided, please identify what you consider to be **major obstacle(s)** to implementation of the integration model for serving students with specific learning disabilities within your child's school.

45. What, if any, concerns do you have about your child's educational placement at this time?

46. If you would be willing for us to talk with you further about your child's school program, please indicate your name and telephone number below.

Name: ________________ Phone Number: ________________

Thank You For Participating In This Study!

ja134

PART II. Status of Special/Regular Education Integration Initiative for Students with Learning Disabilities: Parent Survey

Use reverse side, if needed. Remember your individual responses will remain confidential.

55. If your child's school is actively seeking to implement the integration model to serve students with specific learning disabilities, what do you consider to be the **primary or basic reason(s)** for this active effort?

56. If your child's school is not seeking to implement the integration model, what do you consider to be the **primary reason(s)**?

57. In the space provided, please identify what you consider to be **major obstacle(s)** to implementation of the integration model for serving students with specific learning disabilities within your child's school.

58. What, if any, concerns do you have about your child's educational placement at this time?

59. If you would be willing for us to talk with you further about your child's school program, please indicate your name and telephone number below.

Name: ______________________ Phone Number: ____________________

Thank You For Participating In This Study!

ja133

Outline for Interviews with School Personnel

Individual Interviewed: ____________ **Position:** ____________:

Interviewer: ______________________

School: ________________ **School Division:** ____________________

School Address: __________________________

____

Facts About Our School (To be obtained from Principal)

School Setting (i.e., geographic region; urban/suburban/rural)

____

Socioeconomic Characterization:

____

____

Total Number of Students: ____

Characterization/Racial/Ethnic Composition:

____

Number of General Classroom Teachers: ____

Number of LD Teachers: _____

Other Special Education Teachers:

____

Other Non-Special Education Support Personnel in the School: (e.g., guidance, remedial teachers):

____

Number of LD Students Receiving Services: _____

In-School LD Program Placement Options:

____

Our Integration Efforts

1. **How Our Efforts to Increase the Integration of Students with Learning Disabilities Began:**

    a. Motivating Factors Influencing Increased Integration Efforts for Students with Learning Disabilities:

    ____

    ____

    ____

    b. Individual(s) Providing Initial Encouragement/Leadership for Increased Integration Efforts

    ____

    c. Date When We Began Thinking About Ways to Increase the Amount Of Time Students With Learning Disabilities Spend in General Education Classrooms:

    ____

    d. Other Comments:

    ____

    ____

    ____

2. **Goals of Our Integration Efforts for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities;**

    ____

    ____

    ____

3. **Preparatory and Continuing Staff Development/Inservice Activities:**

    a. Extent and Duration of Preparatory Planning

    ____

    ____

    ____

b. Description of Planning Process

c. How Planning Time was Made Available

d. Continuing Planning Efforts

e. Comments:

4. **Indicators to Be Used to Evaluate Outcomes of Integration Efforts and Person(s) Responsible:**

5. **Impact on School Resources** (Note any impact on the following school resources):

   a. Supervisory Support:

   b. General Education Teachers

c. LD Teachers:

d. Other Special Education Personnel

e. Instructional Aides

f. Instructional Space

g. Instructional Equipment and Materials

h. Staff Development/Inservice Support

i. School/Community Relations/Communications

j. Program Evaluation Support

k. Other

l. Comments/Recommendations

6. **Overall Impact of Integration on Policy & Procedures:**

a. Special Education Referrals

b. LD Eligibility

c. Daily Schedule

d. Grading Standards

e. Procedures to Monitor Student Outcomes

f. Program Evaluation

7. **Initial/Current Staff Reactions to Integration Efforts**:

a. Supervisory Personnel

____

____

b. Principal:

____

____

c. General Classroom Teachers

____

____

d. LD Teachers

____

____

e. Other Support Personnel

____

____

f. LD Students

____

____

g. Parents of LD Students

____

____

h. Non-Disabled Students

____

____

i. Parents of Non-Disabled Students

____

____

j. School Board Members

____

____

k. Other(s) (Please Specify)

____

____

l. Comments

____

____

8. **Planning for Instruction in Integrated Classrooms:**

a. Extent of Joint Planning Opportunities:

____

____

____

b. Adequacy of Joint Planning Time:

____

____

c. General Frequency of Joint Planning:

____

____

d. How Joint Planning Time Has Been Scheduled:

____

____

e. Role of General Classroom Teacher in Planning for Integrated Instruction

f. Role of LD Teacher in Planning for Integrated Instruction

g. Role of Others in Planning for Integrated Instruction (e.g., principal, special education/general education supervisors, other in-school support personnel, parents of LD students, LD students, etc.)

h. Comments/Recommendations

9. **Instruction in Integrated Classrooms:**

a. Instructional Role of General Classroom Teacher in Integrated Classroom

b. Instructional Role of LD Teacher in Integrated Classroom

c. Instruction Role of Any Others in Integrated Classroom (e.g., aides, volunteers, etc.)

d. Extent to Which Above Roles are Comfortable

10. **Typical Instructional Adaptations Made for LD Students in Integrated Classrooms:**

Instructional Expectations

Instructional Groupings

Instructional Methods

Instructional Materials

Instructional Pace

Evaluation Procedures/Standards

11. **Perceived Adequacy of Instructional Accommodations for LD Students in Integrated Classrooms (Note comments adjacent to individual being interviewed):**

   a. Central Office Supervisory Personnel

   b. Principal:

   c. General Classroom Teachers

   d. LD Teachers

   e. Other Support Personnel

   f. LD Students

g. Parents of LD Students

h. Non-Disabled Students

i. Comments/Recommendations

12. **Typical Daily Schedule for LD Teacher (To be requested from LD teacher(s). Provide sample day/week if possible.)**

Time Activity

13. **Availability of In-School "Pull-Out" Services for LD Students:**

Comments/Recommendations:

14. **Obstacles Encountered with Integration Efforts to Date:**

Strategies to Overcome Identified Obstacles:

Outcomes of Strategies:

Comments/Recommendations:

15. **Observed Impact of Integrated Instruction on LD Students :**

a. Attitude toward learning and school

b. Satisfaction in integrated classroom(s)

c. Social Acceptance in Integrated Classroom(s)

d. Academic Success in integrated classroom(s)

Classroom tests

Six week/Semester Grades

____

____

Prospects for Promotion to Next Grade/Level

____

____

16. **Observed Impact of Integrated Instruction on Non-Disabled Students :**

a. Skill/Content Coverage

____

____

b. Task Engagement

____

____

c. Attitude toward learning and school

____

____

d. Satisfaction in integrated classroom(s)

____

____

e. Academic success in integrated classroom(s) (e.g., grades)

____

____

17. **Overall Impression of Integration Model for LD Students**

a. Strengths:

b. Weaknesses/Continuing Needs

18. **Unrealized Goals for Integration of LD Students:**

19. **Anticipated Next Steps or Refinements for Integration Effort :**

20. **Things You'd Do Differently If Starting Over with Integration Efforts for LD Students:**

21. **Recommendations for Replication Elsewhere:**

Virginia Tech SLD Research Project
Cherry Houck, Principal Investigator)

Outline for Interview with Parents of Students with Specific Learning Disabilities

Parent's Name: ____________________ **Child's Name:** ______________________

School: ____________________ **School Division:** ______________________

Name of Interviewer: ____________________ **Date of Interview:** ______________

1. What specific learning disability(ies) does your child have?

   When was your child's learning disability first identified?

2. **How long** has your child been receiving special education services through the school?

3. **What type** of learning disability program is your child participating in this year?

4. **Where** does he/she receive any special education services (e.g., totally within the regular classroom, some pull-out or resource room instruction)?

404

5. Does your child spend any **time with the learning disabilities teacher** each week?

If so, about how much time per week (in hours)?

6. Are there specific subjects or classes that your child finds more **difficult**?

7. Are there specific subjects or classes that your child finds **easier** than others?

8. Are you aware of any **attempts to increase** the amount of time your child spends in the regular classroom this year or in the last few years?

If so, how did you become aware of such efforts?

What do you think has prompted these efforts?

9. Are you aware of any **specific goals** for increasing the amount of time students with learning disabilities spend in the regular classroom within your child's school?

If so, what are the goals?

To what extent have you been **involved in planning**: for increased integration of your child in the regular classroom program?

10. To your knowledge, are your child's **in-school assignments** being adjusted or adapted to accommodate for his/her individual needs in the regular classroom during this school year?

If so, what instructional adaptations are being made for your child within the regular classroom?

11. To your knowledge, has your child been **able to complete** his or her assignments successfully **within** the regular classroom?

If not, what problems have been encountered?

12. To your knowledge, are your child's **homework** assignments being adjusted to accommodate for his/her individual needs? If so, how have they been adjusted?

14. Do you think that your child is receiving the instructional support and adaptations he/she needs in order to be successful?

Why/why not?

15. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

Response Choices:

Agree Tend to Agree Tend to Disagree Disagree No Opinion

a. The integration model reduces the stigma associated with specific learning disabilities.

b. Equal or superior learning opportunities are available for students with specific learning disabilities when the integration model is used.

c. Students with learning disabilities learn no differently from their non-disabled peers.

d. Regular classroom teachers have the skills to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.

e. Regular classroom teachers are willing to make needed instructional adaptations for students with specific learning disabilities.

f. "Pull-out" programs do students with learning disabilities more harm than good.

g. Dropout rates will decrease for students with specific learning disabilities through use of the integration model.

h. Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.

i. Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.

j. Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.

k. School personnel have encouraged use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.

#15 Continued

Response Choices:

Agree Tend to Agree Tend to Disagree Disagree No Opinion

h. Post-school adjustment of students with specific learning disabilities will improve through use of the integration model.

i. Local parents support use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.

j. Total integration is a realistic goal for all students with specific learning disabilities.

k. School personnel have encouraged use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities.

16. What does your child say about his/her **academic work** this year?

17. Overall, what has your child said regarding his/her **feelings about school** this year?

18. What **feedback** have you received from the school regarding your child's academic performance this year in terms of:

    a. Competence in basic skills (reading, written expression, math)?

    b. Work habits?

    c. Ability to keep up with the class?

d. Quality of work products?

e. Grades?

f. Overall classroom behavior?

g. Other facets of performance?

19. Based on **your own observations**, what, if any, changes have you noticed as a result of the increased time your child is spending in the regular classroom?

Response Choices:

Positive Change **No Change** **Negative Change** **Can't Judge**

a. Standardized test measures of academic achievement

b. Grades for each grading period?

c. Your child's attitude toward learning and school?

d. Your child's satisfaction in his or her school placement?

e. Your child's social acceptance within the regular classroom?

f. Your satisfaction with the educational program provided for your child?

g. Your child's prospects for promotion/passing this year?

h. Your child's prospects for completing high school?

i. The availability of appropriate educational services for your child?

20. What do **you envision** your child doing after he/she finishes school?

21. Has your **child ever expressed** what he/she would like to do after finishing school?

22. Given the nature of your child's specific learning disability and his/her school progress to date, do you **foresee any problems** in achieving these plans?

23. Based on your judgement of your child's special learning needs, what type of educational placement **option would you prefer?**

    ____ Full-time integration--all instruction delivered by the regular classroom teacher

    ____ Full-time integration--all instruction delivered in the regular classroom by **both** the regular classroom teacher and learning disabilities teacher.

    ____ Part-time integration in the regular classroom with LD services provided in **another setting** such as the resource room, as needed.

    ____ I don't know.

24. What is your **overall opinion** of the increased efforts to use the "integration model" for addressing your child's special learning needs?

25. Do you think the integration efforts undertaken this year have been **realistic**?

26. What factors do you think are most important in **judging the success** of efforts to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular classroom through use of the integration model?

27. What, if any, **effect** has increased use of the integration model had on you as a parent of a child with a specific learning disability?

28. Based on your own experiences, what **comments and/or suggestions** would you offer others regarding increased use of the integration model for students with specific learning disabilities?

29. Other comments?

Thank you for sharing your views.
We appreciate your participation!

Virginia Tech SLD Research Project
(Cherry Houck, Principal Investigator)

411

VIRGINIA TECH
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
319 War Memorial Hall
Bitnet: HOUCK at VTVM1

BLACKSBURG, VIRGINIA 24061-0313

(703) 231-5269
FAX 703-231-3717

Date ______________

Dear Parent:

During the past several years, many schools in Virginia have been working to increase the amount of time students with learning disabilities spend in regular classrooms. As a part of a state-wide project funded by the U.S. Department of Education, we are conducting research to determine how students, parents, teachers, and administrators feel about these integration efforts.

On ____________________, we will be visiting in your child's school to learn more about the increased integration efforts and how those who have been involved feel about these program changes. I am writing to request permission to interview your child as part of this research. Be assured that information shared in this interview will remain confidential and used only to generate an overall view of students' perceptions. No responses will be reported by name or school system. The interview should take no more than 15 minutes of your child's time and would be scheduled to avoid unnecessary disruption of his or her daily instructional program. If you and your child agrees to participate, I also will need to check with your child's school to determine his or her most recent achievement and intelligence test scores.

Thank you for considering this request. If you are willing to allow your child to participate, please fill in and sign the attached form and return it to your child's school so we can schedule the interview. Please do not hesitate to call me if you have any questions concerning this request (703-231-5269).

Sincerely,

Cherry K. Houck

Cherry K. Houck
Professor of Education

Attachments: Permission Form
Topic Overview

Request for Participation
Virginia Tech Research Project: Students' Views of Learning Disabilities Services

1. I give permission for ______________________________ *(child's name)* to be interviewed as part of the Virginia Tech research project on integration funded by the U.S. Department of Education. I understand that the interview will be conducted at school by members of the Virginia Tech project staff and that the interview would be scheduled to avoid unnecessary disruption of his or her instructional program. I further grant permission for the release of my child's most recent achievement and intelligence test scores with the understanding that this information will be used only to describe the total groups of students interviewed and not reported by my child's name at any time.

☐Yes ☐No

Parent or Guardian Signature ______________________________
Relationship to Child (e.g., mother, father, other) ______________________________
Home Address: ______________________________
____
Home Phone Number ______________________________
Today's Date ______________________________

2. My child is willing to participate in the Virginia Tech research project on integration funded by the U.S. Department of Education.

☐Yes ☐No

Child's Signature ______________________________

Child's Full Name ______________________________
Date of Birth ______________________________
Name of School ______________________________
Current Grade Level ______________________________
When was your child's learning disability first identified? ______________________________
Child's Current LD Teacher ______________________________

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

3. I would be willing to share my own views regarding my child's current educational program with the research project staff.

☐Yes ☐No

Initiative Group: ____Ex; ____SW; ____NA

Virginia Tech Research Project:
Students' Views of LD Services

SUBJECT INFORMATION SHEET

SUBJECT CODE: ____________________

STUDENT'S NAME: ____________________

SCHOOL: ____________________

HOME ADDRESS: ____________________

____

____

GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION
OF SCHOOL: _____Urban (1) _____Rural (2) _____Suburban (3)

RRENT GRADE LEVEL: (91-92)_______ DATE OF BIRTH:____yr/____mo/____/day

NDER:

____MALE (1) ____FEMALE (2)

ETHNIC GROUP:

____African American (1)
____Asian (2)
____Caucasian (3)
____Hispanic (4)
____Native American (5)
____Unknown (10)

ATTENDANCE RECORD: # of Days Absent for 91-92 ______

Date of
Interview: ____________________

Interviewer: ____________________

Grade level when
first identified
for LD services: ____________________

PRIMARY DISABILITY:

____Learning Disability (1)
Specific Disability(ies) ____________________
____

SECONDARY DISABILITY:

____Emotionally Disturbed (1)
____Speech and Language Impaired (2)
____Visually Impaired (3)
____Hearing Impaired (4)
____Physically Impaired (5)
____Other Health Impairment (6)
(e.g. ADHD)

jal32

RECENT TEST SCORES

A. Score(s) from most recent individually administered intelligence test:

Name of Test	**Date Given**	**Score(s) (Please indicate standard scores if available)**

B. Score(s) from most recent individually administered general achievement test:

Name of Test	**Date Given**	**Score(s) (Please indicate standard scores if available)**

Subject Code: ____________________

Student's Name: ____________________

Virginia Tech Research Project:
Students' Views of LD Services

Student Interview Instrument

Good morning (afternoon), __________________________. My name is ______________________________________. I'm from Virginia Tech in Blacksburg and I'm gathering information for some research we're doing to find out how students with learning disabilities feel about school. I'd like to ask you some questions, but first, I want to be sure you understand that whatever you tell me will not be shared with anyone at your school... not your teacher(s), the principal, or anyone else. My questions should take you about 20 minutes. If it's OK with you, I'd like to tape what we say to help me keep track of what you have to tell me. Is that all right?

1. **If yes**, turn on tape.
2. **If no or reluctant**, say, I'll just take some notes.

School Schedule

Answers to Question 1 are to be written on Form A which is attached to survey.

1. First, I would like to learn about your school day.
    a. What is your schedule during a normal school day? (What class do you have first, second, third....?)
    b. Who is your teacher for this class or subject? (Name)
    c. Is there another teacher or other adult in the room during this class or subject? (Yes - No)
    d. What does this person usually do during this period?

General Questions

2. Is there a particular subject or class that seems easier for you?

☐Yes (1) ☐No (2) ☐I don't know (10)

Which one? ______________________________

Why does this class seem easier? ______________________________

____

____

3. Is there a particular subject or class that seems more difficult for you?

☐Yes (1) ☐No (2) ☐I don't know (10)

Which one? ______________________________

Why does this class seem more difficult? ______________________________

____

____

Answers to Questions 4 a and b are to be listed on Form A which is attached to survey.

4.

a. Thinking back to your class schedule, tell me if you are able to complete class assignments on your own as I name each of your classes.

Please answer,

All of the time(1) Most of the time(2) Some of the time(3) Never(4)
I don't know(10)

Why did you answer this way?

b. Now, tell me if your assignments are the same as the other students in your class(es) as I name each of your subjects/classes.

Please answer,

All of the time(1) Most of the time(2) Some of the time(3) Never(4)
I don't know(10)

If different, tell me how your assignments are different?

5. How do you feel the work you do in your class(es) compares to the work of other students in your class(es)? It's –

   ☐Better than most(1) ☐About equal to or the same as others(2)
   ☐Not as good as others(3) ☐I don't know(4)

6. When you need help in your class(s), are you comfortable asking your teachers for assistance?

   ☐All of the time(1) ☐Most of the time(2) ☐Some of the time(3) ☐Never(4)
   ☐I don't know(10)

   Why did you answer this way? ______________________________

   ____

   ____

7. Where do you usually receive this help?

   ☐ In a classroom with the rest of my class (1)
   ☐ In a different room (2) (please specify: ______________________)

8. When you need extra help with what you are learning or school work, where would you prefer to receive help?

   ☐ In the classroom with all other students (1)
   ☐ In separate classroom with other students who need extra help (2)
   (please specify: ______________________________)
   ☐ It does not matter (3)

   Why did you answer this way? ______________________________

   ____

   ____

9. Do you think you get the help you need in school?

   ☐All of the time(1) ☐Most of the time(2) ☐Some of the time(3) ☐Never(4)
   ☐I don't know(10)

   Why did you answer this way? ______________________________

   ____

   ____

Subject Code__________

10. When you have homework, are your homework assignments the same as the other students in your classes?

☐All of the time(1) ☐Most of the time(2) ☐Some of the time(3) ☐Never(4)
☐I don't know(10)

If different, how? ____

____

____

11. Are you able to complete your homework by yourself?

☐All of the time(1) ☐Most of the time(2) ☐Some of the time(3) ☐Never(4)
☐Can't Judge(10) ☐I don't know(10)

If not, what makes your homework difficult for you to complete by yourself?

____

____

12. If you need help on your homework, who do you usually ask?

☐Mother(1)
☐Father(2)
☐Other family member(3)
☐Friend(4)
☐Other(s)(5), please specify ________________
☐I don't ask anyone(10)

13. Now, I want you to think about the grades you have earned this year...

How do you feel about these grades? They are –

☐Very good(1) ☐Good(2) ☐Need improvement(3) ☐I don't know(10)

Why do you feel this way? ____

____

____

14. What do you think your teacher(s) would say about your grades? They are –

☐Very good(1) ☐Good(2) ☐Need improvement(3) ☐I don't know(10)

15. What do you think your parent(s) would say about your grades?

☐Very good(1) ☐Good(2) ☐Need improvement(3) ☐I don't know(10)

Subject Code ________

ja131

16. Overall, how do you feel about school?

☐I like school a lot (1)
☐It's OK (2)
☐I do not like school (3)
☐I don't know (4)

Why did you answer this way? ____________________

____

____

17. Do you feel comfortable around other students in your classes when you're --

a. learning something new?

☐All of the time(1) ☐Most of the time(2) ☐Some of the time(3) ☐Never(4)
☐I don't know(10)

Why did you answer this way? ____________________

____

____

b. completing a work assignment --

☐All of the time(1) ☐Most of the time(2) ☐Some of the time(3) ☐Never(4)
☐I don't know(10)

Why did you answer this way? ____________________

____

____

c. In social situations (lunch, clubs, recess, sports) --

☐All of the time(1) ☐Most of the time(2) ☐Some of the time(3) ☐Never(4)
☐I don't know(10)

Why did you answer this way? ____________________

____

____

18. Do you plan to finish high school?

☐Yes(1) ☐No(2) ☐I don't know(10)

Subject Code ________

19. Have you thought about what you would like to do when you finish school?

☐Yes(1) ☐No(2) ☐I don't know(10)

Tell me what you would like to do. ______________________________

____

____

20. Do you see any problems in achieving these plans?

☐Yes(1) ☐No(2) ☐I don't know(10)

If Yes, what problems do you see? ______________________________

____

____

____

21. Tell me one thing your teacher(s) could do to help you be more successful in school.

____

____

22. Are there any other things that would make school and learning better for you?

____

____

____

23. How much control do you think you have over your success at school?

☐I have total control (1)
☐I have some control (2)
☐I have little control (3)
☐I have no control (4)
☐I don't know (10)

24. Is there anything else you would like to tell me about school?

____

____

____

421

Subject Code: __________

Ending Remarks

(turn tape off)

Thank you for taking this time to talk with me about school. I want you to know that I appreciate your being so open. Remember, what we have discussed will only be shared with others working on this research. You have helped us learn what students think and we value your opinions.

Subject Code:__________

FORM A: Responses to Questions 1 and 4

Q1: Schedule/Teacher			Q4a: Able to Complete Assignments						Q4b: Assignments Same					
Subject	Teacher	Another Adult in Room and What This Person Does	(1) Always	(2) Most of the Time	(3) Some of the Time	(4) Never	(10) Can't Judge	Why Answered This Way	(1) Always	(2) Most of the Time	(3) Some of the Time	(4) Never	(10) Can't Judge	How Different

ja105

Focus for Observations in Integrated Classrooms

Directions for Observers:

- Plan to be at the classroom at the designated time.
- Introduce yourself to the teacher and tell her/him that you are anxious to get a view of a normal instructional period where LD students are integrated. Thank the teacher for allowing us to visit his/her integrated classroom. Clarify how long you will be in the classroom.
- Give the teacher a copy of the observation sheet and indicate that you will be taking notes but that our purpose is not, in any way, to evaluate his/her teaching but rather to learn more about the integrated setting for students with specific learning disabilities. Tell the teacher you would be happy to let him or her review your observation worksheet. Make arrangements to do so, if desired.
- Ask the teacher if the class is grouped in any way and for the name(s) and seating location of LD students who will be in the class. **Tell the teacher that you do not want to do do anything that would draw attention to the LD students.**
- Determine where you should sit and move to that area.
- When the observation is complete, thank the teacher and leave the room quietly.

Time/Date/Location of Observation: ____________________

Teacher's Name: ____________________________________

Observer's Name: ______________________________

1. **Description of Class**

   a. Grade/Subject:

   b. Ability Grouping? ____Yes ____No

   c. Number of Students: __________

   d. Number of LD Students: ____________

   e. Number of Teachers (Including Aides) in Classroom: ___________

   f. Seating Configuration:

2. **What Was the Instructional Focus/Expectations of the Lesson?**

Any adaptations?

a. **Check All Instruction Methods Employed during Observation:**

___ Teacher Demonstration (__ Regular __ LD)
___ Teacher Lecture (__ Regular __ LD)
___ Teacher Led Discussion (__ Regular __ LD)
___ Teacher Led Small Group Work (__ Regular __ LD)
___ Individual Instruction By Teacher(s) (__ Regular __ LD __ Aide)
___ Student Led Small Group Work
___ Student Presentations/Reports
___ Peer Teaching
___ Individual Seat Work
___ Computer-Assisted Instruction
___ Media Presentation (Film/TV) (__ Regular __ LD)
___ Other (Specify) (__ Regular __ LD)

b. **Instructional Materials Used:**

Any adaptations?

3. **Outcome Monitoring Procedures:**

Any adaptations?

4. **Note Primary Role(s) of Instructional Personnel During Observation Period:**

General Classroom Teacher:

LD Teacher:

Aide:

Other(s) (Specify):

5. **To What Extent Did the LD Students Exhibit Task Engagement?**

6. **Were LD Students Able to Successfully Complete the In-Class Tasks/Assignments?**

7. **To What Extent Did the LD Students Seek Teacher Assistance?**

8. **What Was the Nature and Extent of Teacher Assistance Provided to LD Students?**

9. **Note Any Self-Referent Statements Made By LD Students**

10. **Note Any Peer Statements About LD Students' Academic Performance:**

11. **Note Any Peer Statements About LD Students' Behavior:**

12. **Note Any Teacher Statements About LD Students' Academic Performance:**

13. **Note Any Teacher Statements About LD Students' Behavior:**

14. **Observations Related to Peer Acceptance of and/or Interaction with LD Student:**

15. **Did the Teacher(s) Share Any Comments or Observations Related to Their Experience with the Integration Model for LD Students?**

16. **Other Comments/Observations**

Virginia Tech SLD Research Project
(Cherry Houck, Principal Investigator)

fn=classob

427

VIRGINIA TECH
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION — **BLACKSBURG, VIRGINIA 24061-0313**
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
319 War Memorial Hall — **(703) 231-5269**
Bitnet: HOUCK at VTVM1 — **FAX 703-231-3717**

May 20, 1992

Mr.
President, *Virginia LDA*

Dear Mr. :

Thank you for returning my call and for considering my request to obtain views related to the integration/inclusion initiative for students with specific learning disabilities from parents who are members of the *Virginia LDA*. As I mentioned, this year we have been working on a research project funded by the USDE to develop a *snapshot* of the status of this initiative in Virginia and *stakeholders'* views related to these program changes. To date, we have obtained information from school personnel throughout Virginia including supervisors of special education programs, general education supervisors, building principals, general education teachers (at the elementary and secondary levels), and LD teachers via a mail survey procedure. (Findings from the special education supervisors' survey were reported at the *LDA* symposium on educational reform in Atlanta and I am enclosing a copy of the working paper I am sending to La Nelle for compilation.) We also have conducted field visits to a small sample of schools engaged in this initiative to interview representatives of the above groups, students with specific learning disabilities, and parents.

To better capture the views of parents and with your permission and assistance, we would like to conduct a mail survey of 100 parents within the *Virginia LDA* during the early part of the summer. Given approval, we could either mail survey materials directly to 100 randomly selected parents or send the survey materials in envelopes to you for distribution to insure anonymity. We would provide postage-paid envelopes for direct return to this office. (Of course we would cover mailing costs should you prefer to mail the surveys.) Enclosed is a copy of the instrument and cover letter we propose to use. As I mentioned, we pilot tested it with a small group of *North Carolina LDA* members earlier this Spring. Although there are many questions we could ask, we will be using items selected from our surveys of other groups for comparison purposes. The cover letter could be revised to indicate that the survey has been reviewed and approved by your Executive Board and the specific procedure used to obtain potential respondents' names. You may even prefer to sign or co-sign the cover letter.

I hope that this project will be of interest to your Executive Board and that we will be able to include parents who are members of *VLDA* in this study. Please let me know if additional information would be helpful. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Cherry K. Houck
Professor of Education

Enclosures: Survey Materials
Working Paper: Supervisors' Study

Directions and Recording Sheet for

VA TECH Parent Survey

Affiliate Information

Name of Local Affiliate: ______________________________

Name & Address of Affiliate Representative: ____________________________

____

Number of Survey Packets to Be Distributed: ______________

Packet Numbers (e.g., 001-014): ________________________________

Directions

1. Number the affiliate membership list (e.g., 001, 002, 003, ...).
2. To secure a systematic sample, select individuals 001, 003, 005, ... and so forth until you have obtained the specified number of persons to be surveyed. (Skip over any person who does not have a child with a specific learning disability in grades K-12.)
3. Record the respondent code and names of the individuals selected in the above procedure on the reverse side of this sheet. (Retain a copy of this form and forward one to Tom Bass.)
4. Address and mail the survey packets making sure each individual is sent the packet corresponding to his/her number.
5. Record date survey materials are mailed: _____________________
6. Mail a copy of the recording sheet to Tom Bass, 505 John Street, Ashland, VA 24005.

Thank you for your assistance!

Recording Sheet

Respondent Code Number *Respondent Name* *Respondent Address*

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____
4. ____
5. ____
6. ____
7. ____
8. ____
9. ____
10. ____
11. ____
12. ____
13. ____
14. ____
15. ____
16. ____
17. ____
18. ____
19. ____
20. ____
21. ____
22. ____
23. ____
24. ____
25. ____

Use additional sheets if needed.

VIRGINIA TECH
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
319 War Memorial Hall
Bitnet: HOUCK at VTVM1

BLACKSBURG, VIRGINIA 24061-0313

(703) 231-5269
FAX 703-231-3717

August 11, 1992

Mrs
Instructional Facilitator

Dear

Thank you for providing me an opportunity to interview you regarding integration/inclusion efforts for students with learning disabilities at Greer Elementary School. The information you shared should prove to be very helpful to other systems considering such an initiative and I certainly do appreciate your insights and suggestions. I was especially interested in the teachers' reactions to this year's program obtained via your questionnaire. As you mentioned, these views, though not representative of all your teachers, provide some direction for program refinement and represent an important piece in the evaluation of this initiative.

Please extend my thanks to for also arranging to meet with me. Clearly, she is committed to this initiative and I'm sure is a tremendous resource within the school.

, as promised, I'm sending along 15 (plus 3 extras) sets of our parent questionnaire. You will need to insert a cover letter to your parents asking them for their participation and return of the survey by July 15. (I'm enclosing a draft insert which you may wish to incorporate. I think you'll also want to indicate why the forms are being returned to a VA Tech address to avoid confusion.) Please keep a record of the packet number that is being sent to each parent so we can keep track of the returned surveys in the event follow-up is desired. Once the forms are returned, I'll have the responses summarized and forward you a copy. This should be available by mid August.

Again, it was a pleasure to met you and learn of your experiences. I look forward to seeing you again and wish you continued success with your school program.

Sincerely,

Cherry K. Houck
Professor of Education

Enclosures: Parent Survey Packets
Survey Record Form
Draft Insert for Cover Letter

CC: Ms.

Directions and Recording Sheet for

VA TECH Parent Survey

School Information

Name of School: Elementary

Name & Address of School Representative: Mrs. .

. Road. ., VA

Number of Survey Packets Distributed: ____________

Packet Numbers: ______________________________

Directions

1. Insert a cover letter in each packet requesting participation.
2. Record the respondent code and names of the individuals being sent the survey on the reverse side of this sheet. (Retain a copy of this form.)
3. Address and mail the survey packets making sure each individual is sent the packet corresponding to his/her number.
4. Record date survey materials are mailed: ____________________
5. Mail a copy of the front of this sheet (do not include the parents' names listed on the back) to Cherry Houck, 319 War Memorial Hall, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia 24061-0313.

Thank you for your assistance!

Recording Sheet

Respondent Code Number *Respondent Name*

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
11.
12.
13.
14.
15.
16.
17.

VIRGINIA TECH
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
319 War Memorial Hall
Bitnet: HOUCK at VTVM1

BLACKSBURG, VIRGINIA 24061-0313
(703) 231-5269
FAX 703-231-3717

March 4, 1992

[redacted]
Program Manager
[redacted]

Dear Mr. [redacted]

I am writing to thank you for responding to our earlier survey regarding efforts to increase the amount of time students with learning disabilities spend in the regular classroom. Your forthright responses are helping us to develop a *snapshot* of current practice and an understanding of factors facilitating and/or inhibiting these integration efforts.

This Spring, we hope to visit ten representative school divisions throughout Virginia in order to better understand such *integration* efforts, how implementation has occurred, critical resources and supports, problem solving that has been required, related outcomes, and any recommendations that could be offered to other systems seeking to initiate efforts to increase integration of students with with specific learning disabilities. Through preliminary analysis of the responses from special education supervisors throughout the state, I noticed that your school division is one reporting active integration efforts. We would like to know more about your division's experiences, and I am wondering if you would be willing for me and my research assistant to visit your system one day this Spring?

To the extent that it is convenient, we hope to schedule our most distant visits during the weeks of May 4-8 and 11-15 and visit those schools closer to Virginia Tech on April 10, 28, 24 & 24th. During these visits we would like to have an opportunity to observe integration efforts and have discussions with:

- you as the Special Education Supervisor (1 hour)
- one General Education Supervisor (30 minutes)
- one building principal engaged in active efforts to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular classroom (30 minutes)
- four or five regular classroom teachers at a time that would not disrupt instruction (20-30 minutes)
- two learning disabilities teachers at a time that would not disrupt instruction (20-30 minutes)
- three students with specific learning disabilities at a time that is least disruptive (A parental permission form and cover letter of explanation will be provided with interviews taking 15-20 minutes)
- two parents of students with specific learning disabilities (30-45 minutes).

I do hope that it will be possible for us to visit within your system for this purpose. Please complete and return the enclosed postcard to let me know if a visit would be possible. Through your continued assistance, we hope to develop a portrait of current integration efforts that can benefit other school divisions.

Once again, thank you for your earlier participation in *Phase I* of this investigation and best wishes for continued success.

Sincerely,

Cherry Houck

Cherry K. Houck
Professor of Education

Enclosure: Postcard RE: Spring Visit

We are willing to have you visit our school division and the school(s) identified below later in the Spring in order to learn more about our integration efforts to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular classroom. I understand that we will be contacted to arrange a mutually convenient date and schedule for the visit. The following schools are representative of our efforts and are willing to host a visit.

Name of School	Principal	Level (Elem./Mid./HS)
1)_____		
2)_____		

_____ We need additional information in considering this request.
Please call me at _____________________
_____ We will be unable to participate as a field-visit site during the Spring.

Signature: ______________________ Phone: ______________

Thank you for considering this request.

435

VIRGINIA TECH
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
319 War Memorial Hall

BLACKSBURG, VIRGINIA 24061-0313
(703) 231-5269

April 13, 1992

Dear

Thank you for granting us a visit within your school division so that we might learn more about your efforts to increase the integration of students with specific learning disabilities in your general education program. As part of our federally funded research project on this topic, we certainly look forward to talking with you and others who are involved in these initiatives at
on

Mrs. Sandra Dill, *Project Research Assistant*, will be joining me in the visit so that we can both be available to meet with the various individuals and visit in classrooms where students with learning disabilities are being integrated throughout the day.

In an effort to ease the schedule coordination task, I am enclosing sheets that can be used to identify and schedule the observation and interviews. You will notice that we have indicated the approximate amount of time we would like to spend with each individual as well. It would be very helpful if we could have a copy of the schedule before our visit or upon arrival. To the extent possible, we would like for our visit to reflect the realities and divergent perspectives associated with your system's integration efforts. We ask that this goal be kept in mind in selection of the various individuals to meet with us.

I am also enclosing consent forms and a cover letter for the parents of students selected for the interviews. We would appreciate your forwarding this cover letter and consent form to the parents. Again, we look forward to our upcoming visit and thank you for this opportunity. Please be assured, we will make every effort to be responsive to the schedules and demands of those with whom we meet.

Sincerely,

Cherry K. Houck
Professor of Education

Enclosures: Visit Schedule Sheets
Student Permission for Interview
Topic Overview
Preparation Steps

CC: Principals

Visit with Virginia Tech Project Staff Seeking to Learn More About the Increased Integration of Students with Specific Learning Disabilities in General Education Classroom(s)

Steps to prepare for visit.

1. Select persons to be interviewed.
2. Arrange interview locations that will be quiet and stress free for students and other participants.
3. Schedule interviews across interviewers, at the convenience of the school and the person to be interviewed, but also allowing for the most efficient use of the visitation time.
4. Insert name of person to be interviewed in cover letter to the information packet. Distribute provided to each person. (Parent packets will include a parent cover letter and three copies of a permission form for the conducting the student interviews).
5. Send the appropriate packet of information to each individual who will be participating in the interviews.
6. Collect parent permission forms in triplicate for conducting the student interviews. A copy should be given to the parent, one copy to be filed at the school and one copy to be given to Virginia Tech project staff.
7. Encourage teachers/school staff to review the purpose of the visit with students and remind them their responses will remain confidential.
8. Forward copy of schedule to Virginia Tech.

Visitation Schedule: Virginia Tech Project on the Status of the Regular/Special Education Integration Initiative for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities

School: ______________________ School Division: ______________________

Principal: ______________________ Primary Division Contact: ______________________

Date of Visit: ______________________

Preferred Schedule (Please indicate the preferred interview times for those individuals who have agreed to meet with us along with the interview location. If convenient, we would like to visit in classrooms where the integration model is being for serving with students with specific learning disabilities during non-interview periods with only one of us in any classroom at any time.) We would like an opportunity to interview the following persons:

1. Special Education Supervisor (1 hour)
2. General Education Supervisor (30 minutes)
3. Building Principal (30 minutes)
4. Regular Classroom Teachers (4 or 5 for 20-30 minutes each)
5. Learning Disability Teacher (2 LD teachers; 20-30 minutes each)
6. Parents of LD Students (2 parents; 30-45 minutes each)
7. LD Students (3 students; 15-20 minutes each)
8. Observation in Integrated Classes

Visitation Schedule for ______________________

Time	Name	Position	Location
8:30-9:00			
9:00-9:30			
9:30-10:00			
10:00-10:30			
10:30-11:00			
11:00-11:30			
11:30-12:00			

Time	Name	Position	Location
12:00-12:30			
12:30-1:00			
1:00-1:30			
1:30-2:00			
2:00-2:30			
2:30-3:00			
3:00-3:30			
3:30-4:00			

VIRGINIA TECH
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
Division of Curriculum and Instruction
319 War Memorial Hall
Bitnet: HOUCK at VTVM1

BLACKSBURG, VIRGINIA 24061-0313
(703) 231-5269
FAX 703-231-3717

Date ______________

Dear ______________________:

During the past several years, many schools in Virginia have been working to increase the amount of time students with learning disabilities spend in the regular classroom(s). As a part of a state-wide project funded by the U.S. Department of Education, we are conducting research to learn more about these changes and how students, parents, teachers, and administrators feel about these integration efforts.

On May we will be visiting your school division to learn how these changes came about in your school(s), the actual experiences of those who have been involved, and reactions and perceived outcomes related to these efforts. During the visit, we will be talking with program supervisors, principals, general classroom teachers, LD teachers, and students with specific learning disabilities and parents.

You have been identified as someone who might be willing to meet with us and discuss your experiences and views related to your school's efforts to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the regular education classroom(s). The interview should take no more than 30 minutes of your time. We hope that you will find it convenient to meet with us and we look forward to the insights you can offer. *Please be assured* that any information you share will remain confidential and used only to generate an overall view of the perceptions of those who play an important role in the education of students with specific learning disabilities. No individual responses will be reported.

An interview sign-up sheet has been provided to so that our meetings can be scheduled at your convenience, and to avoid unnecessary disruption of the daily instructional program. We hope you will find it convenient to meet with us. I am enclosing an overview of the type of information we hope to gather in our visits. We want our time with you to result in a genuine sharing of experiences and views through an informal exchange.

Please do not hesitate to call me at (703) 231-5269 or Ms. Sandra Dill at (703) 231-7040 if you have any questions prior to our visit. I look forward to meeting with you.

Sincerely,

Cherry K. Houck
Professor of Education

Attachment: Topic Overview

Interview Confirmation Form

Visit with Virginia Tech Project Staff Seeking to Learn More About the Increased Integration of Students with Specific Learning Disabilities in General Education Classroom(s)

Thank you for agreeing to meet Virginia Tech staff regarding your efforts to increase the amount of time students with specific learning disabilities spend in the general education classroom(s). As we have agreed, I have scheduled your interview as follows:

Interview Date/Time/Place

Date: ____________________

Time of Meeting: ________________

Place: __________________________________

If you are unable to meet with the Virginia Tech project staff at the designated time, please let me know so that a replacement may be found. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Phone: ____________________

fn = Remind

Outline for Integration Casebook

School: ______________ **School Division:** __________________

School Address: ________________________

____

1. Facts About Our School: (This information will be obtained from appropriate person(s))
    a. School Setting (i.e., geographic region; urban/suburban/rural)
    b. Socioeconomic Characteristics
    c. Total Number of Students _____
    d. Racial/Ethnic Composition
    e. Number of General Classroom Teachers _____
    f. Number of LD Teachers ______
    g. Other Special Education Teachers
    h. Other Non-Special Education Support Personnel in the School
    i. Number of LD Students Receiving Services
    j. In-School LD Program Placement Options
2. **How Our Efforts to Increase the Integration of Students with Learning Disabilities Began:**
3. **Goals of Our Integration Efforts for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities:**
4. **Preparatory and Continuing Staff Development/Inservice Activities:**
5. **Indicators Being Used to Evaluate Outcomes of Integration Efforts and Person(s) Responsible:**
6. **Impact of Increased Integration Efforts on School Resources:**
7. **Overall Impact Of Increased Integration Efforts on Policy & Procedures:**
8. **Initial Staff Reactions to Integration Efforts:**
9. **Planning for Instruction in Integrated Classrooms:**
10. **Typical Instructional Adaptations Made for LD Students in Integrated Classrooms:**
    a. **Instructional Expectations**

   - b. Instructional Groupings
   - c. Instructional Methods
   - d. Instructional Materials
   - e. Instructional Pace
   - f. Evaluation Procedures/Standards

11. Impact of Increased Integration Efforts on the Roles/Activities of *Stakeholders*:
12. Typical Daily Schedule for LD Teacher (Sample day/week activities):
13. Obstacles Encountered to Date Associated with Increased Integration Efforts:
14. Strategies to Overcome Identified Obstacles:
15. Observed Impact of Integrated Instruction on Non-Disabled Students:
    - a. Skill/Content Coverage
    - b. Task Engagement
    - c. Attitude toward learning and school
    - d. Satisfaction in integrated classroom(s)
    - e. Academic success in integrated classroom(s) (e.g., grades)
16. Perceived Adequacy of Instructional Accommodations for LD Students in Integrated Classrooms:
17. Current Reactions of Other *Stakeholders* to the Integration of LD Students:
18. Overall Impression of Integration Model for LD Students:
    - a. Strengths
    - b. Weaknesses/Continuing Needs
    - c. Unrealized Goals for Integration of LD Students
19. Availability of In-School "Pull-Out" Services for LD Students:
20. Anticipated Next Steps or Program Refinements:
21. Things You'd Do Differently if Starting Over:
22. Recommendations for Replication Elsewhere:

445

Project Staff Guidelines for Field Visits

As you know, the school divisions have graciously agreed to serve as a site for our field visits to enable us to learn more about the status and nature of integration efforts for students with specific learning disabilities. I have assured each system that we would do everything possible to avoid unnecessary disruptions of the school day and that any information collected would be integrated to form a composite case report with no individually identifiable findings shared at any time. The following visitation guidelines will help to ensure that we honor these commitments. Please take time and review them carefully.

Cherry Houck

Pre-Visit

1. Make all pre-visit arrangements with sufficient lead time to avoid last minute notifications or requests.
2. Pre-visit materials should be well-organized and designed to minimize the burden on school district personnel.
3. Review visitation schedules and check for workability.
4. Secure directions to the initial visit site and prepare written copies for each person who will be participating in the field visit. (Approximate travel times will be needed.)
5. Carefully review the interview and observation materials recording sheets so that each interview can be conducted in an informal manner.

Visitation

1. Arrive at the designated site at least 15 minutes before first scheduled interview.
2. Check in with the contact person and building principal upon arrival for:
    a. introductions
    b. presentation of courtesy copy of field visit materials
    c. review the day's schedule and designated interview & observation locations
    d. determine how student test data is to be accessed
    e. obtain copies of student interview & test data access permission forms (Sandra Dill will take responsibility for securing the student test data according to the principal's directions.)
    f. other directions
3. Begin interviews/observations/test data collection as scheduled and **stay on schedule**.
4. At the beginning of each interview, express our appreciation for the interviewee's assistance and state that we are conducting the follow-up visits to learn *first-hand* about the increased general education/special education integration efforts for students with specific learning disabilities. (Although such efforts may involve the integration of students with other disabilities, in this study, our **focus is restricted** to specific learning disabilities.)

446

5. Assure each interviewee that all their comments will be used to form a composite view of their school's efforts as part of a *Casebook* and that no individually identificatory information will be shared. Encourage each individual to share his or her views openly.
6. Begin each interview/observation on time and indicate that there are many facets to explore in a very limited time period. Confirm the scheduled length for the interview/observation.
7. Indicate that the interview/observation forms have been designed to help us focus and make notes of our discussions/observations. Offer the interviewee or individual(s) in the classroom to be observed a copy of the record forms so that they will know what we hope to learn. Ask if there are any questions before beginning the interview or observation.
8. Proceed with the relevant queries noting responses on the interview forms. Pace the interview according to the schedule.
9. Thank the interviewee or individuals in classrooms being observed for his/her time and ask if there are any other things s/he or she would like to share. Conclude the interview/observation and check to see that the record sheet is complete and appropriately coded by category of interviewees or observation.
10. **See observation form for specific guidelines.
11. **Keep all materials in a secure/confidential place. Do not leave any collected data unattended.**
12. Check off assigned interviews or observations as completed and note any time variations or notable conditions.
13. Before leaving the school, check to see that all materials have been collected and that no additional information is needed.
14. Check by the principal's office to thank him/her for the visit and to report how the schedule worked. Invite any comments. Indicate that we will be developing a composite and sharing it with them.

Post-Visit

1. Write a follow-up to each contact person and building principal expressing our thanks for hosting the visit.
2. Develop a composite case study for inclusion in the *Casebook*.
3. Summarize findings across settings by participant categories.
4. Prepare final report of field visits for inclusion in the overall project report.
5. Distribute a copy of the *Casebook* to hosting systems and others as designated in the project workscope.

447

Profile of One-Year Academic Achievement for Students with Specific Learning Disabilities

Directions

Thank you for agreeing to provide data on randomly selected cases illustrating one-year academic achievement for students with specific learning disabilities. To insure uniformity, we are asking that you use the following procedure for selecting and recording the achievement data.

1. Using an alphabetically or numerically ordered caseload list, select the first, third, fifth, seventh, and ninth students with specific learning disabilities who have participated in the integration program model this school year.
2. Record the individual standardized achievement test data (e.g., reading, written expression, mathematics) for
   - Spring 1991 and
   - Spring 1992 (when available)

   on the attached sheets for each of the selected cases on the attached form.
3. Write your name and phone number on each form in the space provided.
4. When the Spring 1992 test data are available, mail this information to the Project Staff in the provided envelop.

If you have any questions, please contact:

Dr. Cherry Houck or Ms. Sandra Dill
SLD Research Project
College of Education
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0313
(703) 231-5269

Thank You For Assisting with This Research!

VIRGINIA TECH SLD RESEARCH PROJECT
Individual Achievement Test Profile

Subject Number ____________ Date of Birth ____________

Gender ____________ Grade ____________

Race ____________

A. READING

____
(Name of Test)

Name of Subtest	Date of Test	Raw Score	Percentile	Grade/Age Stand. Score

B. MATHEMATICS

____
(Name of Test)

Name of Subtest	Date of Test	Raw Score	Percentile	Grade/Age Stand. Score

C. WRITTEN LANGUAGE

____
(Name of Test)

Name of Subtest	Date of Test	Raw Score	Percentile	Grade/Age Stand. Score

Exhibit L

Summary of Submitted Materials Related to Integration Effort[1]

Site	Title	Type	Description	Guidelines	Philosophy	Policies	Other	Notable Features	Contact Person
Albemarle County Public Schools	Final Draft of Special Education Task Force Recommendations (Draft)	Task Force Report	Three-page document listing ten belief statements regarding inclusion for all students and four recommendations for implementing inclusion		x			Lists steps for examining feasibility of implementing inclusion and provides suggested steps for implementation	Lois Brown, Director, Special Education, Albemarle County Public Schools, 401 McIntire Rd., Charlottesville, VA 22901
Botetourt County Public Schools	Special Education Inservice Program Collaborative Teaching: Does It Work?	Staff Development Materials	Twenty-eight page document outlines staff development modules on collaborative teaching from three different presentations. Information includes handouts and sample forms. Materials cover collaborative teaching techniques appropriate for elementary through secondary levels.				x	Collaborative Teaching Weekly Planning Form Tips for Successful Collaboration	Phyllis T. Simmons, Supervisor, Botetourt County Public Schools, P.O. Box 309, Fincastle, VA 24090
Bedford County Public Schools (	Student Grading and Evaluation (June, 1991)	Policy Statement	A three-page policy statement governing evaluation of handicapped students in the regular education classes. This policy covers grading procedures followed by commentary and clarification regarding assignment of grades in specific content areas and acceptable alternative testing procedures. Provides examples of behavior (which, if present) would preclude alternative assignment of grades.			x		Board approved grading policy. Provides commentary and clarification for each general point. Uses the term "alternative assignment" for personalized instruction and adjustments required for special education students. Lists seven methods for alternative evaluation or testing.	Dr. Sharon Dodson, Bedford County Public Schools, 310 Bridge St., Bedford, VA 24523
Bedford County Public Schools (cont.) Liberty High School	Proposed Structure Program "Match Up" (Draft)	Procedures	A five-page document which describes a procedure for LD students integrated into regular education science and social studies classes. Also includes a student instructional profile sheet used to facilitate communication between special educators and general education teachers.	x				Student Instructional Profile includes learning styles, vocational information, and work-related behaviors. A six-week progress report is included which is completed by the regular class teacher and returned to the IEP manager.	see above
Charlottesville Public Schools	Mainstreaming Procedures	Procedures	A 20-page booklet which contains suggestions for planning for mainstreaming and preparing for implementation. (Delineation of responsibilities). Appendices include a checklist for deciding when to mainstream and a mainstreaming contract.	x				Contains a section entitled-"When a Mainstreamed Student Has Difficulty." Offers ideas for interventions when problems begin.	Marianne Rosiewicz, Supervisor of Special Education, Charlottesville Public Schools, 1400 Melbourne Rd., Charlottesville, VA 22901
Fairfax County Public Schools	Learning Disabilities School-Based Demonstration Project First -Year Evaluation Report: Preliminary Findings	Evaluation Report	This 11-page document outlines the school board approved priority to continue development of a full continuum of services to meet the needs of special education students in school-based program. Preparation steps are included along with an overview of evaluation results. Appendices include a description of the demonstration project, chronology , and parent involvement. Sample surveys used in evaluation process are included.				x	Includes a description of integrated program model with four options--Learning Lab, Learning, Center, Immersion/Class-based, and Combination	Fairfax County Public School, 10210 Layton Hall Drive, Fairfax, VA 22030

---

[1] Summaries based on content analysis of materials submitted in response to survey or obtained during follow-up site visits

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Site	Title	Type	Description	Guidelines	Philosophy	Policies	Other	Notable Features	Contact Person
Fairfax County Public Schools (cont.)	Integration	Position Paper	This eight-page paper defines integration and divides student outcomes into three domains (1)academic integration, (2) social integration, (3) community integration. Each domain is defined specifically and outcomes are listed along with student activities which support the student outcomes.	x				Student outcomes and student activities are accompanied with a listing of six to eight staff initiatives which support that specific domain.	see above
Fairfax County Chesterbrook School	Chesterbrook Elementary School Network	Mission statement and objectives for learning disability program.	This document includes a letter to parents explaining the integration concept and the proposed pilot project to be implemented during the 1991-92 school year. A mission statement, seven objectives, program benefits, and guidelines follow.		x			Includes a chronological listing of activities which facilitated communications with key groups such as parents, staff, and community during initial implementation stage.	Mrs. Helen Davis, Chesterbrook Elementary School, 1753 Kirby Road, McLean, VA 22101
Fairfax County Schools (cont.)	Of the Future: Fairfax County Public Schools--Annual Operating Plan	Annual Plan	This 49-page document includes the school board's missions statement, school board priorities and annual operating plan. Objective, 8 listed on page 21, relates back to the school board policy which calls for continued evaluation and modification of a full continuum of services for special education students.				x	Provides an example of a system-wide objective for special education which is based on student outcomes. Reader is able to compare special education objectives with other instructional objectives in the overall plan.	see above
Hanover County Public Schools	Integrated Educational Opportunities for All Students	Grant Summary	This two-page overview describes procedures for implementing a mainstreaming grant. Steps include formation of a county-wide advisory committee and six site-based mainstreaming teams. An overview of staff development activities is included.				x	Includes a one-page summary listing pros and cons for integration and a curriculum design based on outcome measures.	Martha EM. Raby, Special Education, Hanover County Public Schools, 200 Berkley St., Ashland, VA 23005
Hanover County Public Schools (cont.)	Integration Guidelines: Hanover County Public Schools, December, 1990	Guidelines and Procedures	This document was developed in response to participation in the Virginia Statewide Systems Change Project. It includes a listing of benefits for disabled and non-disabled students. Guidelines for the formation and procedures for site teams to follow is included. Suggestions for integration are grouped into categories: preschool, elementary, middle, and high school.	x				Includes a summary of models for creating social interaction and describes "circles of friends," a technique for helping handicapped students make friends with non-disabled peers.	See above
Roanoke City Public Schools Oakland Intermediate School	Student Support Referral and Student Evaluation Form	Referral and student evaluation form	This referral form includes a statement of concern, a plan of action to resolve concern, and results of intervention. The evaluation report utilizes the following evaluation code: DU=demonstrates understanding; DC=developing comprehension; NH=Needs additional help.			x		Student evaluation form includes a section for parents to evaluate the students' learning skills along with the student and teacher. Examples of skills are "completes assignments, uses time well"," etc.	Carroll Smith, Oakland Intermediate School, 3229 Williamson Road, Roanoke, VA 24031
King William County Public Schools	Modifications for the Regular Classroom	Form	This form contains modifications in the area of attending, directions, organization, handwriting, academics, and tests. Becomes part of the IEP.				x	This one-page form requires regular classroom teacher's signature which verifies that the special education teacher has reviewed the modifications with the regular classroom teacher.	Patricia Ball, King William Public School, P.O. Box 185, King William, VA 23086

Overview of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving Students with Learning Disability

Name of School: Mary Carr Greer Elementary School

Contact Person: Patricia Lloyd
2055 Lambs Rd.
Charlottesville, VA
22901

School Division: Albemarle County Public Schools

Phone Number: (804) 973-8371

Facts About Our School:

School Setting: K-5 Suburban

Socioeconomic Characteristics: Very Transient

Racial/Ethnic Characterization: 10% minority students; ESL students included

Total Students: 605

Number of LD Teachers: 2

Other Support Personnel: Speech/Language Pathologist

Number of LD Students Receiving Services: 18 (1991-92)

Our Integration Efforts:

Date We Began Our Increased Integration Efforts for LD Students: 1991-92

Motivating Factors:

- Large number of students at the 4th and 5th grade levels who were in self-contained placement
- Began to recognize need for LD students and parents to feel part of school and remain in home school. Attended the "On Common Ground" conference
- Had administrators who were looking at the advantages and disadvantages of integration
- Moved to a non-categorical model

Goals:

- To place students in "regular" settings
- To give support to teacher so that everyone could benefit

Preparation for Increased Efforts: Most training was through one-on-one conferencing and support. There was not a lot of training before program was initiated however system sent a team to William and Mary for conference.

Initial Staff Reactions: Some initial reactions related to "turf" issues. Staff reactions were varied; they ranged from being pleased to disfavoring the integration model. Staff members were in favor of co-teaching. LD teachers did not want to be seen as "aides." Some staff were concerned that "numbers" rather than students' needs were driving the program.

Impact on School Resources: A full-time instructional aide was needed. The standard budget was increased and a general classroom was dedicated to the initiative and equipped with a computer.

Impact on Policies/Operating Procedures: Special education referrals increased for 2nd and 3rd grades but remained the same at the 4th and 5th levels in what is typically a "low referral" building. Program evaluation has been done informally though use of a teacher survey and oral feedback from parents and teachers.

Planning for Integrated Instruction: See above

Extent/Schedule: Team meetings were scheduled after school (2:30-3:15) each Thursday. LD staff has attempted to meet problems as they arise.

Perceived Adequacy: Currently, joint planning time is perceived as inadequate. Need to have more time for planning and to discuss problems.

Instructional Roles in Integrated Instruction: These will require negotiation each year to reflect students' needs. All personnel must be very flexible.

General Education Teachers: The general education teacher delivers instruction and sets the standards for the class.

LD Teachers: The LD teachers(i.e., special education teachers) provide instructional support and sometimes serve as instructional leaders. One LD teacher has assumed responsibilities for a heterogeneous classroom and is engaged in activities to enhance students' acceptance and reduction of any stigma associated with learning disabilities (e.g., running the school store, teaching higher order thinking skills, etc.)

Aides/Others: --

Typical Instructional Adaptations in Integrated Classrooms:

- Adaptation of SOL's with decisions regarding the most important content and skills
- Adjusted expectations while maintaining quality standards
- Both teachers provide ideas and materials for lesson

In-School Availability of Service Options for LD Students: Available as needed

Observed Impact of Increased Integration Efforts:

Impact on LD Students: LD students now have a more positive attitude toward learning and feel like they are part of the school. The social acceptance of LD students also has been very good.

Impact on Staff: Staff members have been frustrated with scheduling problems. Administrative support has been a positive influence.

Impact on Others (e.g., non-disabled, support staff, etc.): No negative impact observed on non-disabled students.

Overall Impressions of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving LD Students:

Program Strengths:

- Increased integration creates a sense of community in the school and increases students' self-esteem
- Shared teacher expertise

Program Weaknesses/Continuing Needs

- Model is time-consuming and time constraints need to be considered in implementation
- Need more collaborative planning
- Need total staff support

Unrealized Goals:

- More "true" teacher collaboration is needed along with the necessary planning time
- Need for more staff preparation
- Teachers need more time to learn and grow
- Need for more parent education
- Having adequate opportunities for co-teaching

Recommendations for Replication Elsewhere:

- Plan before making any changes
- Talk to parents to "pave the way"
- Develop a research -based model
- Be flexible
- Obtain commitment from leaders (They must truly believe that everyone will benefit from this model.)
- Consider instructional needs of students
- Develop a strategy to deal with resistance of staff members

- Keep a continuum of options available; avoid a single service system
- Take it slowly & work together

Exhibits (If any): Final Draft of Special Education Services Task Force Recommendations.

Overview of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving Students with Learning Disabilities

Name of School: Otter River

Contact Person: Bruce Shefferman
Rt. 1
Goode, Virginia
24556

School Division: Bedford County

Phone Number: (703) 586-9210

Facts About Our School:

School Setting: Rural

Socioeconomic Characteristics: Lower middle class

Racial/Ethnic Characterization: Predominantly Caucasian

Total Students: 260

Number of Classroom Teachers: 11

Number of LD Teachers: 1

Other Support Personnel: Regular ED, EMH, HI, Preschool Handicapped

Number of LD Students Receiving Services: 11 (at beginning of school year)

Our Integration Efforts:

Date We Began Our Increased Integration Efforts for LD Students: Spring 1991

Motivating Factors:

- Students with learning disabilities had a wide range of abilities but had been placed in the same LD class. There was dissatisfaction with the class configuration and content focus.
- As LD students progressed, they lacked needed skills. The integration model was initiated in an attempt to alleviate these problems.

Goals:

- To make all students feel a part of the regular education classroom.
- To take the labels off special education.
- To assist students to become better citizens by obtaining content area knowledge.

Preparation for Increased Efforts: Special education administrators and school administrators planned an inservice. In the summer, the special education teachers met with general education teachers to discuss the integration effort. They wanted to keep students on grade level as much as possible. Preparation focused on joint planning of goals and instruction to meet all students' needs.

Initial Staff Reactions: Initially, general education teachers were apprehensive because some had no previous experience teaching special needs students. A teacher at each grade level was asked to volunteer to be the spokesperson for that grade. Teachers expressed concern about meeting the needs of LD students and about such issues as room sharing and roles in instruction. Teachers also were concerned about not having enough planning time.

Impact on School Resources: General education teachers were given more assistance from an instructional aide during one class period. The LD teacher no longer has a specific room but "floats" to various classrooms.

Impact on Policies/Operating Procedures: A modified grading scale was developed for LD students. Some scheduling difficulties were experienced since it was hard for the LD teacher to spend time with all students. Although approximately the same number of referrals for special education were received, not as many were sent on for full evaluation.

Planning for Integrated Instruction:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Extent/Schedule: The participating staff members try to plan collaboratively for at least one hour each week.

Perceived Adequacy: The joint planning time is perceived as inadequate. Teachers believe there should be more time for dealing with "specifics" concerning instruction in integrated classrooms. Also, planning time should be built into the school day and should be long enough for problems to be resolved without interruptions. Otherwise, the out-of-school time needed can be overwhelming and frustrating.

Instructional Roles in Integrated Instruction:

General Education Teachers: General education teachers typically introduce the lessons and provide primary instruction. In some instances, the LD teacher and general education teachers alternate roles during a lesson.

LD Teachers: - The LD teachers assumes a different role in the various classrooms. She works to illustrates "easier" or "different" ways of doing things. She assists all students in the classrooms. In some instances, she may have a "pull-out" reading group.

Aides/Others: --

Typical Instructional Adaptations in Integrated Classrooms:

- Shortened assignments (e.g., a reduced number of spelling words)
- Students may read on their level a couple of days each week
- Use of motivational materials (charts, smiley faces, etc.)

In-School Availability of Service Options for LD Students: Other options are available. LD teacher may take student to another location for instruction, if needed.

Observed Impact of Increased Integration Efforts:

Impact on LD Students: Respondents report mixed views regarding impact of integration on LD students. One individual reported that LD students now have increased self-esteem and feel better about themselves in all areas. Others cite positive effects such as more social acceptance and increased academic content knowledge. One teacher expressed concern for a particular student who feels angry and frustrated in the integrated classroom. This teacher is working with the class and this student to increase social acceptance.

Impact on Staff: Has caused some changes in teachers' room assignments.

Impact on Others (e.g., non-disabled, support staff, etc.): Sometimes, non-disabled students believe that they are being treated unfairly. They perceive that they may have to work harder for certain grades. Non-disabled students have progressed academically. They also have developed a greater understanding of individuals and individual differences.

Overall Impressions of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving LD Students:

Program Strengths:

- Administrators are supportive and enthusiastic.
- Most teachers believe that students with Learning Disabilities will have increased self-esteem and feel more like contributing to the class.
- Students who would normally "fall through the cracks" will also get help
- Two teachers working together add to the effectiveness of instructions
- Students will learn first-hand that everyone is different

Program Weaknesses/Continuing Needs

- Teachers would like to be better prepared for integration
- General education teachers would like more time for joint planning with the LD teachers
- Teachers desired additional information regarding specific roles for planning and instruction in the integrated classroom

Unrealized Goals:

fn=OtterR

- All goals have not been completely realized
- Some teachers believe that academic gains were not as high as they had hoped
- General and LD teachers need more joint planning time
- The LD teacher expressed a need for "more control" over entire school day

Recommendations for Replication Elsewhere:

- Visit other systems' programs and encourage others to visit your program
- Provide more opportunities for teachers to observe collaborative teaching
- Make sure the LD teacher has a manageable workload & schedule
- Educate parents about program
- Encourage teachers to work cooperatively
- Be flexible and patient

Exhibits (If any):

Overview of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving Students with Learning Disabilities

Name of School: **Liberty High School**

Contact Person: Dewitt House
100 Liberty Minuteman Dr.
Bedford, VA 24523

School Division: Bedford County Public Schools

Phone Number: (703) 586-2541

Facts About Our School:

School Setting: Rural

Socioeconomic Characteristics: Middle Class

Racial/Ethnic Characterization: 12% African-American; less than 1% Asian

Total Students: 910

Number of Classroom Teachers: 52

Number of LD Teachers: 4

Other Support Personnel: 1 TMH, 1 ED, Guidance Counselors, itinerant Speech and Language Pathologist

Number of LD Students Receiving Services: 65-70

Our Integration Efforts:

Date We Began Our Increased Integration Efforts for LD Students: Began with previous principal in 1983 Current efforts began four years ago with implementation of teacher assistance teams.

Motivating Factors:

- Desire to keep students in their home school
- To enhance students' self-esteem
- To diminish students' feeling of isolation and being singled out from peers

Goals:

- To decrease the number of pull-out classes and increase inclusion and integration
- To assist LD students to be successful and to feel more a part of the group
- To provide the best education possible
- To cultivate understanding of differences
- To integrate LD students so that they are indistinguishable from others in regular class

Preparation for Increased Efforts: For current efforts (1991-92), a meeting was held at beginning of the school year followed by individual conferencing between LD staff and general teachers. Looked at individual students' needs with structured communication every six weeks.

Initial Staff Reactions: Staff members were very accepting in some departments. Most general education teachers believe that LD students should be in regular class if they can do the work. Some are resistant. Generally teachers are positive about placing LD students in integrated classrooms

Impact on School Resources: Need more materials that are appropriate for LD students in general classrooms.

Impact on Policies/Operating Procedures: Staff members think that number of referrals may increase. Grading standards should not be lowered, but teachers should become more aware of individual needs (with help from LD teacher and modifications). Daily schedule has changed for LD teachers who are now going into general classes.

Planning for Integrated Instruction:

Extent/Schedule: Joint planning ranged from common planning periods to unscheduled meetings. Some teachers pass notes and converse informally during the school day as time permits.

Perceived Adequacy: Most teachers expressed a need for more planing time while others reported the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

planning time was adequate.

Instructional Roles in Integrated Instruction:

General Education Teachers: General education teachers have the responsibility to plan and teach the classes and to communicate with the LD teachers.

LD Teachers: LD teachers provide assistance to general education teachers and students as needed, and are in constant communication with general teachers to review modifications planned and to give feedback to the general classrooms teachers.

Aides/Others: --

Typical Instructional Adaptations in Integrated Classrooms:

- Adjusted expectations
- Use of tape recorders
- Alternate or adjusted tests
- Highlighted texts
- Use of the buddy system
- Organizational notebooks
- Extended time for tests and assignments
- Tutoring

In-School Availability of Service Options for LD Students: Pull-out is provided if needed.

Observed Impact of Increased Integration Efforts:

Impact on LD Students: Staff members report a positive effect on attitude toward school and learning. One teacher cited students' increased pride in school work. Social acceptance is reported as fairly good but some problems remain. Some feel it is better if non-disabled students are unaware that a student has a learning disability.

Impact on Staff: Integration requires additional paraprofessionals. LD teachers will not always be available to teach content or pull-out program with new plan that is scheduled for implementation during the 1992-93 school year.

Impact on Others (e.g., non-disabled, support staff, etc.): No impact reported for non-disabled peers or support staff.

Overall Impressions of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving LD Students:

Program Strengths:

- The provision of additional assistance for the slow learners
- Improved communication among school staff
- Better preparation of students for real-life situations

Program Weaknesses/Continuing Needs

- Resistance of some staff members to change and to engage in collaborative teaching
- Need for homogeneously grouped classes
- Need for formal staff development

Unrealized Goals:

- Would like to see integration of TMH students continued
- For all LD students to be able to read in order to be successful in content area courses

Recommendations for Replication Elsewhere:

- Provide inservice to all teachers in Learning Disabilities and methods for teaching students with learning disabilities
- Allocate sufficient time and support to implement program
- Focus on communication and provide immediate responses to requests for assistance from regular classroom teachers
- Begin with cooperative teaching and move slowing into other classrooms

Exhibits (If any)

Liberty High School Progress Report
IEP Management

Overview of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving Students with Learning Disabilities

Name of School: **Cardinal Forest Elementary School**

Contact Person:
Patricia Kreiber
8600 Forrester Blvd.
Springfiled, VA
22152

School Division: Fairfax County Public Schools

Phone Number: ((703) 451-1455

Facts About Our School:

School Setting: Urban

Socioeconomic Characteristics: Middle Class

Racial/Ethnic Characterization: 10-12% African-American; a small percentage of Asian and Vietnamese

Total Students: 650

Number of Classroom Teachers: 21 1/2

Number of LD Teachers: 5

Other Support Personnel: 3 aides, 1.5 counselors, 1 reading teacher, ESL teachers

Our Integration Efforts:

Date We Began Our Increased Integration Efforts for LD Students: Spring 1990

Motivating Factors:

- Cardinal Forest was selected as a pilot school for the integration project
- The principal and LD teachers were interested in providing a different type of service; one that utilized instructional strategies appropriate for LD children

Goals:

- To improve self-esteem by integrating LD students into a heterogeneous group
- To provide role models for appropriate leaning and social behavior
- To reduce the stigma of "pull-out" programs

Preparation for Increased Efforts: Attended inservice programs provided by the central office staff. Met with faculty members from another school that had implemented the integration model during the previous year. Surveyed teachers regarding mainstreaming and visited other school with integrated programs. Involved all staff members in review and planning. Formed a site team and worked during the summer to develop a plan. Received assistance from the central office staff, when requested.

Initial Staff Reactions: Initial reactions differed depending. Some staff members were willing to try this new approach without hesitation while others felt they should make changes because they were expected to o so. Several staff members expressed concern related to the amount of work involved and some "turf" issues were voiced."

Impact on School Resources:
-More computers are needed and additional space would be helpful. Sometimes, open classroom are loud and cause students to be easily distracted. Larger rooms would create space for small group work.
-Need to continue staff development efforts.

Impact on Policies/Operating Procedures: Monitoring procedures basically follow the IEP. Goals need to be added to assist with implementation in general classrooms settings. Referrals do not seem to be affected by integration except that the LD teacher is now in the general classrooms and can observe students with high risk behavior such as ADHD.

Planning for Integrated Instruction:

Extent/Schedule: Joint planing time is available Monday afternoons (early dismissal allows extra time for planning). Other planning time is sought before school, during the IEP conferences and on teacher work days. One week plans are developed by grade level.

Perceived Adequacy; Joint planning time is perceived as inadequate. One respondent suggested that substitutes might be used to free teacher for planning.

Instructional Roles in Integrated Instruction:

General Education Teachers: Respondents indicated that the general education teachers are responsible for teaching most of the times.

LD Teachers: LD teachers monitor and provide alternative instructional strategies. One LD teacher reported that the general classroom teachers planned the lessons and she taught the lesson.

Aides/Others: Aides do some planning and, some instances, engage in small group instruction.

Typical Instructional Adaptations in Integrated Classrooms:

- Expectations are personalized
- Generally the same assignments are used but expectations are modified
- Modifications are made in length of assignment
- Taping lectures and books
- Use of overhead projectors for instruction
- Paired reading
- Reading aloud

In-School Availability of Service Options for LD Students: The Learning Lab is a "pull-out" support option. Co-teaching occurs in the general classroom.

Observed Impact of Increased Integration Efforts:

Impact on LD Students: Attitudes toward school and learning have improved for the majority of students. Most have a sense of accomplishment when completing class assignments even if their quality in not as good. Most are more satisfied being with the large group. Improvement in academic performance also is reported.

Impact on Staff: This is the first year some teachers have had students with learning disabilities in their classrooms. LD teachers have felt a little overwhelmed. The number of students in the Learning Labs has increased.

Overall Impressions of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving LD Students:

Program Strengths:

-The integration model allows LD students to get the "best of both world"
-LD teacher can get a better overall picture of the child's functioning
-The LD students' self-esteem and ability to socialize are improved

Program Weaknesses/Continuing Needs

-Increased number of students in the general classroom who are not counted on the class rolls
-Inadequate time for planning and scheduling

Unrealized Goals:

-Concern regarding, "Have I done enough?"
-Need for real teaming next year to include co-planning and co-teaching
- Need "buy-in" by staff at every level

Recommendations for Replication Elsewhere:

- Be realistic
- Have guidelines that are flexible
- Learn from others' experiences with the model
- Obtain teachers' commitment to the model at the outset of the initiative
- Get the parents involved.
- Consider using a strong mentor or volunteer program.
-Emphasize communication
- Be open-minded and flexible

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Overview of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving Students with Learning Disabilities

Name of School: **Chesterbrook Elementary**

Contact Person:
Helen Davis, Principal
1753 Kirby Road,
McLean, VA 22101

School Division: Fairfax County Public School

Phone Number: (703) 356-3200

Facts About Our School:

School Setting: Suburban

Socioeconomic Characteristics: 85-95% of parents hold graduate degrees

Racial/Ethnic Characterization: 86% Caucasian, 7% Asian, 5% Hispanic, 2% African-American

Total Students: 400

Number of Classroom Teachers: 14

Number of LD Teachers: 4

Other Support Personnel: Counselor, librarian, music and P.E. teachers

Number of LD Students Receiving Services: 54

Our Integration Efforts:

Date We Began Our Increased Integration Efforts for LD Students: January 1990

Motivating Factors:

- Wanted to move students back to their home schools
- Parents of students with disabilities wanted students with non-disabled children
- Wanted to increase students' self-esteem
- Staff knew county was moving toward integration and wanted to give it their best effort

Goals:

- The main goal was to increase academic success for students
- To serve LD students at home-based school
- To enhance sense of belonging among LD students

Preparation for Increased Efforts: The school formed a site-based team that included general education teachers, special education teachers, and support staff (e.g., the librarian). The team met over the summer on a voluntary basis to develop an implementation plan. The plan has been revised periodically depending upon student and school needs.

Initial Staff Reactions: At first, the adjustment was difficult; especially the issue of classroom ownership. Overall, the teachers believe that all students benefit. One teacher has been impressed with the quality of instruction.

Impact on School Resources: Central administrator believes that there will be a need for more LD teachers to keep student/teacher ratios down. Some money will be saved on transportation. Teachers have gained a greater variety of teaching strategies. Several respondents report a need for more training and inservice support. There is an increased need for computers due to the increased severity of LD students being integrated.

Impact on Policies/Operating Procedures: The number of special education referrals has decreased among older students. Among younger students, referrals have remained about the same. One respondent reported that the daily schedule is now "exciting and different." Many resource students now receive more direct instruction in needed content areas due to integration.

Planning for Integrated Instruction:

Extent/Schedule Joint Planning: Planning is done whenever possible (before school, during lunch, after school). A more formal type of planning takes place on Mondays due to early dismissal.

Perceived Adequacy: Almost all respondents reported the need for more joint planning time.

Instructional Roles in Integrated Instruction:

General Education Teachers: A variety of instructional roles were reported by general education teachers. Some teachers take turns with LD teacher serving as the "lead" teacher at times. One respondent indicated that the general education teacher is responsible for most of the grading. Other teachers shared co-teaching responsibilities with the LD teacher, depending upon who felt most comfortable with the content.

LD Teachers:). The LD teachers often alternated with general education teachers. At times they serve as "lead" teacher and at other times they monitor students' work. One LD teacher worked more with small groups and focused on study and organization skills.

Aides/Others: The reading resource teacher helps in the classroom. The guidance counselor works with students in the classroom on social skills. One aide monitors students' work during reading.

Typical Instructional Adaptations in Integrated Classrooms:

- Use of heterogeneous groupings
- Incorporation of computers as instructional tools
- Facilitating access to class notes
- Use of manipulatives
- Allowing extra time to complete assignments
- Use of books on tape
- Use of lower level reading material.
- Incorporation of visual aides in lessons
- Use of role playing and real- life problem solving

In-School Availability of Service Options for LD Students: Pull-out program available for younger students. Co-teaching and integrated classrooms available at all levels. Direct instruction by LD teacher can occur in regular or separate classroom.

Observed Impact of Increased Integration Efforts:

Impact on LD Students: LD students' standardized test scores have been improving. Their motivation to learn has increased and they are socially accepted in the integrated classroom. They now feel like they are part of the school. Most teachers reported positive results in all areas.

Impact on Staff: Overall, general education teachers feel that integration has had a positive impact. LD teachers feel that more planning time is needed. General education teachers report that they have gained a greater variety of teaching strategies, and LD teachers report that they have gained a greater knowledge of content.

Impact on Others (e.g., non-disabled, support staff, etc.): General Education teachers report that non-disabled students are positive in regards to attitude, satisfaction, and academic success in integrated classrooms. One respondent expressed concern that the class seems less focused because of the slower pace.

Overall Impressions of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving LD Students:

Program Strengths:

- All students benefit
- Students can remain in their home schools
- Staff members gain greater knowledge of content and strategies
- Excellent teacher willingness to work together
- Skills of resource teacher are being used with all students
- Class atmosphere is more conducive to learning

Program Weaknesses/Continuing Needs:

- Lack of planning time (joint and individual)
- Need for additional computers
- Scheduling problems
- Need for reduced class sizes

466

fn=CBrook

Unrealized Goals:

- Need for adaptations for all LD students
- Progress for all LD students, even those with severe disabilities

Recommendations for Replication Elsewhere:

- Go slowly, spend a lot of time in training
- Include general education early on in planning and program development
- Hold frequent meetings for site teams and school staff
- Have a consistent master schedule
- Work out scheduling conflicts
- Have a flexible program design dependent on student needs
- Get all staff members involved
- Provide information to students about program changes

Exhibits (If any):

Chesterbrook Elementary School Network: Mission Statement and Objectives

Overview of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving Students with Learning Disabilities

Name of School: Cold Harbor

Contact Person:
Debra Hodge
Rt. 8, Box 220
Mechanicsville, VA 23111

School Division: Hanover County Public School

Phone Number: (804) 730-3312

Facts About Our School:

School Setting: Suburban

Socioeconomic Characteristics: Middle Class - (No Chapter I)

Racial/Ethnic Characterization: 1% Asian, 13-15% African-American

Total Students: 722

Number of Classroom Teachers: 30

Number of LD Teachers: 3

Other Support Personnel: ED, EMR, Remedial Reading, Guidance, Itinerant Speech/Language, Visually Impaired

Number of LD Students Receiving Services: 42

Our Integration Efforts:

Date We Began Our Increased Integration Efforts for LD Students: Mid Spring of last year and beginning of 1991-92 school year with very preliminary planning begun in 1989.

Motivating Factors:

- Efforts began as part of the statewide "Systems Change" project
- Given high priority by the division Superintendent
- Saw a need for less isolation of LD students
- Considered the integration model as an opportunities for enhanced social skill development

Goals:

- For all LD students to remain in general education classes and have the support they need to be successful
- To provide opportunity for the LD and general education teachers to be involved in collaborative teaching
- To provide an information base to assist teachers in implementing integration
- To allow individual school facilities to develop a personalized plan for increased integration
- To assist LD students in dealing with real life situations they will encounter as adults

Preparation for Increased Efforts: Formation of a division level integration team and an on-site or building level team at each school. At Cold Harbor, an inservice was held in Fall 1991. Two videotapes were shown and written information was shared. Representatives from the team met with their grade level to plan and share.

Initial Staff Reactions: Reactions were varied. General education teachers were concerned about the amount of time the LD teacher would be available. LD teachers were concerned about the finite number of hours in a day. Administrators were supportive.

Impact on School Resources: Impact on daily schedule: general education teachers felt they lost flexibility. Some respondents felt they were being asked to do double work and others felt their work load was impossible given the number of hours available.

Impact on Policies/Operating Procedures: The integration efforts have forced general education and LD teachers to look at individual students and to work together. Scheduling has become complicated. LD

fn=charbor

teachers' time has been affected. There is concern that the teaching and non-instructor load is too difficult without extra assistance.

Planning for Integrated Instruction:

Extent/Schedule: Before and after school.

Perceived Adequacy: Planning time is perceived as inadequate. Some staff members felt they could do a better job with more planning time.

Instructional Roles in Integrated Instruction:

General Education Teachers: The classroom teacher is viewed as the lead teacher.

LD Teachers: The LD teacher functions as a support (e.g., assisting with materials, adding to instruction, offering different strategies).

Aides/Others: --Aides and volunteers are used as tutors but not for direct instruction.

Typical Instructional Adaptations in Integrated Classrooms:

- Shortened assignments
- Individual and small group instruction
- Use of larger print
- Use of alternate reading series.
- Use of manipulatives
- Instruction in all modalities
- Tests taken in LD classrooms
- Variation in pace
- Explicit teaching of study and organization skills

In-School Availability of Service Options for LD Students: Yes

Observed Impact of Increased Integration Efforts:

Impact on LD Students: Positive impact. Academic success is better. One respondent felt it depended on the individual and how well he/she was able to mix. Seems to be harder for 5th graders.

Impact on Staff: Some LD teachers are less protective of their LD students. Some general education teachers reported less fear or uncertainty in working with LD students. Others have felt stress due to lack of clear plans.

Impact on Others (e.g., non-disabled, support staff, etc.): Non-disabled students have benefited from having additional teachers in the classroom who can give additional help when needed. Different strategies have worked for all students.

Overall Impressions of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving LD Students:

Program Strengths:

- LD students feel more accepted and included
- The LD students are no longer stereotyped
- General classroom teachers are more awareness of children's unique needs
- LD teachers have gained a better understanding of general education students
- More team work has developed

Program Weaknesses/Continuing Needs

- Fiscal constraints
- Inadequacy of planning time
- Large class size
- Scheduling

Unrealized Goals:

- To have all children included and accepted
- To have more collaboration with all specialists
- Consistency in carrying out plans

Recommendations for Replication Elsewhere:

- Realize that general education teachers may perceive LD students are not getting same services
- Start staff development two years before implementation
- Have a master plan in mind
- Include parents and community in the planning efforts
- Be prepared to acknowledge the need for more personnel

Exhibits (If any):

Hanover County Public Schools: Integrated Educational Opportunities For All Students

Overview of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving Students with Learning Disabilities

Name of School: **Hamilton Holmes School**

Contact Person:
Douglas L. Childers
Rt. 1, Box 96
King William, VA
23086

School Division: King William County Public Schools

Phone Number: (804) 769-3316

Facts About Our School:

School Setting: Rural

Socioeconomic Characteristics: Farming; wide disparity from very poor to wealthy

Racial/Ethnic Characterization: 35% African-American and less than 1% Asian

Total Students: 704

Number of Classroom Teachers: 47

Number of LD Teachers: 4.5

Other Support Personnel: 1 EMR, 1 TMR, 0.5 ED, Related Services (Speech, OT and PT)

Number of LD Students Receiving Services: 53

Our Integration Efforts:

Date We Began Our Increased Integration Efforts for LD Students: Current LD program began about eight years ago. Integration efforts began Fall 1991.

Motivating Factors:

- Desire that students with learning disabilities be less isolated
- View that students with learning disabilities can learn from their peers and need to be exposed to models
- Some students with learning disabilities who were receiving consultative services needed collaborative teaching for support
- Many non-disabled students also could receive help

Goals:

- To return students with learning disabilities to the general classroom as soon as possible
- To create an environment where all students are accepted by everyone in the school community

Preparation for Increased Efforts: A staff development program was planned and implemented for all school staff by the special education staff. Literature was shared and information from classes and conferences attended. Staff has worked together on integration efforts and through the child study committees.

Initial Staff Reactions: General classroom teachers would welcome support from the LD teachers in their teaching and non-teaching tasks.

Impact on School Resources: Created a special education department and appointed a department head. Scheduling has been affected. Some flexibility has been lost with integration. Increased caseloads have caused some resentment among teachers.

Impact on Policies/Operating Procedures: More collaboration is needed between LD and general education teachers regarding grades.

Planning for Integrated Instruction:

Extent/Schedule: Majority of planning occurs during the IEP process. Unscheduled planning occurs during the day and before and after school.

471

fn=HHolmes.doc-1

Perceived Adequacy: Planning time is perceived as being inadequate for the level of planning needed to meet students' special needs and to coordinate instruction.

Instructional Roles in Integrated Instruction:

General Education Teachers: General education teachers make modification as needed and request support when needed.

LD Teachers: LD teachers provide supplemental instruction for concepts and support for general classroom teachers.

Aides/Other: --

Typical Instructional Adaptations in Integrated Classrooms:

- Shortened assignments such as reductions of spelling list
- Use of buddy system
- Use of manipulatives in math instruction
- Use of typewriter or word processors
- Access to taped books
- Use of study guides for lectures
- Variation in instructional pace

In-School Availability of Service Options for LD Students: Self-contained, resource, and consultation services are available to serve students.

Observed Impact of Increased Integration Efforts:

Impact on LD Students: LD students' attitudes have improved. Students come to school with a clearer idea of classroom expectations. Social acceptance also is good. LD students are expected to do what others do with necessary modifications.

Impact on Staff: LD teachers are going into homerooms and providing effective monitoring. Some teachers fear increased caseloads may occur because of program changes and that this will be overwhelming.

Impact on Others (e.g., non-disabled, support staff, etc.): No impact on non-disabled students was reported. One respondent stated that non-disabled students are accustomed to being with LD student in other activities.

Overall Impressions of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving LD Students:

Program Strengths:

- Teachers are caring and sensitive
- Self-contained students are being moved into the general classrooms and to the resource program
- Classroom integration is taking place as much as possible

Program Weaknesses/Continuing Needs

- More staff development is needed
- Staff members need to observe in other systems using the integration model
- Need more communication between general and special education personnel

Unrealized Goals:

- Convincing parents that their child can be successful in regular classroom

Recommendations for Replication Elsewhere:

- Make sure the student is ready to be integrated
- Provide needed support to general education teachers
- Involve parents
- Develop open communication among all who are involved

Exhibits (If any): IEP Modifications List

Overview of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving Students with Learning Disabilities

Name of School: King William Senior High

Contact Person: Harry Rippeon
Rt. 1., Box 401
King William, VA 23086

School Division: King William Public Schools

Phone Number: (804) 769-2708

Facts About Our School:

School Setting: Rural

Socioeconomic Characteristics: Broad range from disadvantaged to middle class and wealthy. Area is a bedroom community for Richmond and Hanover County.

Racial/Ethnic Characterization: 65% Caucasian, 30% African-American, 5% Indian

Total Students: 485

Number of Teachers: 4 Cross Categorical

Other Support Personnel:: 3 EMH teachers

Number of LD Students Receiving Services: 30-40

Our Integration Efforts:

Date We Began Our Increased Integration Efforts for LD Students: Fall 1991

Motivating Factors:

- Desire to increase social skills of LD students
- A good plan presented by the IEP coordinator
- Increased integration was believed to be a better way to meet student needs

Goals:

- To better integrate LD students and to help students who are not classified as LD
- To offer more individual attention by having two teachers in the classroom
- To increase students' learning and achievement

Preparation for Increased Efforts: Have provided two in-service programs. Also, two teachers visited another county that is implementing integration efforts. Some staff members are attending classes at William and Mary in the resource consulting teacher program.

Initial Staff Reactions: Special education director "paved the way." System is using site-based management. Classroom teachers are very supportive. All volunteered to be cooperative teacher next year (1992-93). LD teachers also were receptive.

Impact on School Resources: Saves on classroom space but requires a lot of staff development and in-depth scheduling.

Impact on Policies/Operating Procedures: Referrals have been about the same over the last two years. Respondents expected them to go down.

Planning for Integrated Instruction:

Extent/Schedule: There is no formal joint planning time. The modifications sheet is explained to the general education teacher. LD teacher provides help with research paper. Planning occurs when needed. Next year hope to assign two LD teachers to 11th grade English. Hope to have common planning period.

Perceived Adequacy: LD and general education teachers need more time to plan together. Now planning occurs through notes and periodically in conferences at end of grading period.

Instructional Roles in Integrated Instruction: Administrator will insist that it be a true partnership.

fn=KHigh-1

Typical Instructional Adaptations in Integrated Classrooms:

- Extended time for tests or assignments
- Cooperative learning groups
- Shortened assignments
- Student conferencing
- Choice for project or product
- Some variation in pace

In-School Availability of Service Options for LD Students: Yes

Observed Impact of Increased Integration Efforts:

Impact of LD Students: - Improvement in self-esteem has been dramatic. Just graduated the first self-contained LD student. Success often depends on the individual student. He/she needs to be "hooked" into something in order to focus. Teachers observed one student beginning to talk in class for the first time.

Impact of Staff: None reported..

Impact of Others (e.g., non-disabled, support staff, etc.) Respondents do not want to "water down" curriculum next year. Most of the students know each other; therefore the impact of integration on non-disabled students may be minimal.

Overall Impressions of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving LD Students:

Program Strengths: -

- IEPs are clear and modifications delineated

Program Weaknesses/Continuing Needs

- Regular teachers could be better informed about needs of LD students
- No structured time for collaboration
- More collaborative teaching is needed
- An aide would be helpful to cover classes for meetings
- In a pull out program, the teacher becomes very close to the students

Unrealized Goals:

- Need to get plans formalized for inservice activities
- Find out how curriculum needs to be modified to include strategies for teaching
- Collaborative teaching is need

Recommendations for Replication Elsewhere:

- General and special educators must be convinced and have the desire to place LD students in general education classrooms.

Exhibits (If any):

Overview of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving Students with Learning Disabilities

Name of School: **Oakland Intermediate**

Contact Person: James Caroll Smith
3229 I Road
Roanoke, VA 24012

School Division: Roanoke City

Phone Number: (703) 981-2651

Facts About Our School:

School Setting: Urban

Socioeconomic Characteristics: 50% Free Lunch

Racial/Ethnic Characterization: 35-36% African-American

Total Students: 175

Number of Classroom Teachers: 7

Number of LD Teachers: 1

Other Support Personnel: 1 EMH, 1 ED

Number of LD Students Receiving Services: 19

Our Integration Efforts:

Date We Began Our Increased Integration Efforts for LD Students: Some LD students were being mainstreamed previously. Increased efforts toward integration occurred this year (1991-1992).

Motivating Factors:

- Principal was aware of the trend toward integration and wanted to prepare the students and staff for these changes
- Strong belief in serving students in the general classroom for improved self-esteem
- To reduce stigma of pull-out program

Goals:

- To raise test scores and improve education of all students
- To increase acceptance of LD students in regular classes
- To provide the most supportive educational and social environment for all students

Preparation for Increased Efforts: Most staff development has been one-on-one conferencing between staff members. One formal inservice program was provided at the beginning of the year. The resource LD teacher has served as primary trainer. Principal facilitated integration, cooperative teaching, and whole language instruction simultaneously. Together these efforts have supported the integration efforts.

Initial Staff Reactions: Teachers report that this initiative has been difficult as all new things tend to be. Some are open and some are resistant. Some general education teachers report a lack of confidence for working with LD students. LD teacher has been a oaitive force.

Impact on School Resources: One general education teacher reports student gains although she has relied on aide and LD teacher for help. Impact depended upon the individual teacher. Some staff members expressed concerns regarding instructional space

Impact on Policies/Operating Procedures: Daily schedules have changed. LD teacher schedules around general classroom schedules. This is very difficult and requires much flexibility.

Planning for Integrated Instruction: .

Extent/Schedule: Joint planning time varies ranging from daily joint planning to very little.

Perceived Adequacy: Joint planning time was perceived as inadequate and very

fn=Oakland

tiring when scheduled between 3:30 -5:30 p.m. This lack of planning time is the biggest "bone of contention."

Instructional Roles in Integrated Instruction:

General Education Teachers: Usually reported to be the instructional leader. Some true team teaching reported by one general education teacher. Some teachers provide a copy of lesson plans to LD teacher and aide and they help to adapt lessons.

LD Teachers: Assists individual LD students, offers alternative strategies for instruction, and monitors student understanding of assignments. Engages in co-teaching in some instances.

Aides/Others: Follows adaptations and rotates around the room assisting students who need help.

Typical Instructional Adaptations in Integrated Classrooms:

- Provide multimodal spelling material
- Use shortened assignments (ex. 7-8 words instead of full list)
- Employ whole language instruction to accommodate for difference in learning pace
- Use cooperative learning groups
- Use of manipulatives in math instruction

In-School Availability of Service Options for LD Students: Offer pull-out services as necessary usually because of students' inappropriate behavior.

Observed Impact of Increased Integration Efforts:

Impact on LD Students: Overall positive but attitude varies by grade level. Young children do not seem aware of difference. Social acceptance is reported as favorable. Academic success is very positive.

Impact on Staff: LD teacher reports integration has enhanced her professional development. She has gone to all training experiences available during last two years. School has asked for additional aide next year. Some general teachers report that they sometimes wish for a "little pull-out time" due to students' disrupting behavior.

Impact on Others (e.g., non-disabled, support staff, etc.): Some staff members feel it is more difficult to integrate ED students because classroom teachers feel "overwhelmed" by them.

Overall Impressions of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving LD Students:

Program Strengths:

- A committed principal willing to take risks
- A comprehensive instructional program which integrates cooperative learning, whole language instruction, and inclusion of special education students

Program Weaknesses/Continuing Needs

- Large percentage of special education students per grade level and few general education classroom
- State recommended case loads are too high
- Time is a problem. Need more for planning and sharing

Unrealized Goals:

- Acceptance of all students in the regular classroom
- Need for more co-teaching and more multi-sensory teaching in the classroom
- Reduction in case load for teachers so LD students are not seen as an extra burden

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Recommendations for Replication Elsewhere:

- Create an honest line of communication between general and special education teachers to avoid misunderstanding or "turf" battles
- Provide fiscal support for additional aides and other resources
- Study carefully and prepare teachers
- Proceed slowly and don't initiate too much at one time

Exhibits (If any):

Roanke City Public Schools: Oakland Intermediate School's Student Support Referral

477

fn=Oakland

Overview of Increased Integration Efforts
for Serving Students with Learning Disabilities

Name of School: **Marion High School**

Contact Person: Mr. Jim R. Sullivan
848 Stage Street
Marion, VA 24354

School Division: Smyth County Public Schools

Phone Number: (703) 783-4731

Facts About Our School:

School Setting: Suburban/rural

Socioeconomic Characteristics: Mixed; greater number of lower SES

Racial/Ethnic Characterization: 97-98% Caucasian; 2% African-American, some Hispanics/Asians

Total Students: 920

Number of Classroom Teachers: 55

Number of LD Teachers: 2

Other Support Personnel: 2 EMH teachers

Number of LD Students Receiving Services: 62

Our Integration Efforts:

Date We Began Our Increased Integration Efforts for LD Students: LD program evolved from study skills remediation in 1977 to a full continuum of services seven to eight years ago. Program has maintained stability for last few years. No recent school efforts to alter what is considered to be a successful program.

Motivating Factors:

- Much earlier, found that self-contained LD students who had not been integrated for any general education classes were unable to handle general education classroom even for electives.
- Also found that self-contained LD students were unable to work with large peer group and they lacked needed social skills. This led to earlier changes to current resource model and cluster -grouping efforts.

Goals:

-To have all special education students enrolled in work study program by the junior year.
-To improve reading and study skills.

Initial Staff Reactions: Currently attitudes vary ranging from teachers feeling all special students should be in separate classes to those that say, "I don't mind integrating LD students and I use cooperative learning to achieve this."

Impact on School Resources: The LD program has grown over the years and additional resources have been made available to meet the growing needs.

Impact on Policies/Operating Procedures:

Planning for Integrated Instruction:

Extent/Schedule: No scheduled joint planning time is available.

Perceived Adequacy: --

Instructional Roles in Integrated Instruction:

General Education Teachers: NA

LD Teachers: *NA*

Aides/Others: NA

Typical Instructional Adaptations in Integrated Classrooms: (Within current program)

- Tests may be aloud in the resource room
- LD students may be grouped for content classes taught by LD teacher or a specially selected general classroom teacher.
- Expectations may be altered in some classes but not in others
- Texts may be read aloud in class or easier texts may be used
- Instructional pace may be varied depending on students' understanding of material

In-School Availability of Service Options for LD Students: Full continuum of services from modified self-contained placement in content areas (formally mainstreamed for P.E., lunch, etc.) to 100% placement in general classroom with progress monitored at least semiannually.

Observed Impact of Increased Integration Efforts:

Impact on LD Students: Some LD students are cooperative but complain that the work in general classroom is too difficult. One teacher reports that LD students are more open in small cluster grouped content area class.

Impact on Staff: Two regular class teachers reported increased satisfaction working with LD students. Other respondents reported that secondary teachers often do not feel adequately trained to work with LD students and feel overwhelmed when faced with a wide range of abilities in their classes.

Impact on Others (e.g., non-disabled, support staff, etc.): None reported.

Overall Impressions of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving LD Students: (Based on current program; No recent efforts to increase integration due to confidence in program.)

Program Strengths:

- Full continuum of services,
- Strong job placement program and vocational rehabilitation services
- Good student success
- Acceptance by non-disabled students, teachers, and parents

Program Weaknesses/Continuing Needs:

- Lack of joint planning time
- Lack of sufficient inservice training

Unrealized Goals:

- LD students often lack skills needed to ask for help and be self-advocates
- Entire faculty has not had an opportunity to participate in inservice training on methods and teaching strategies for instructing LD students.

Recommendations for Replication Elsewhere:

- Carefully select placement in general education classrooms to avoid student/teacher mix-matches
- Take a slow approach to change
- Keep the students' needs in mind when considering change
- Resist pressures from outside forces for initiatives that appear counter to wisdom gained from direct school experience

Exhibits (If any):

Overview of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving Students with Learning Disabilities

Name of School: **Marion Intermediate School**

Contact Person: William Graybeal
820 Stage Street
Marion, VA 24354

School Division: Smyth County Public Schools

Phone Number: (703) 783-4731

Facts About Our School:

School Setting: Suburban/rural

Socioeconomic Characteristics: Mixed; greater number of low SES

Racial/Ethnic Characterization: 97-98% Caucasian; 2% African-American; some Hispanics & Asians

Number of Classroom Teachers: 21

Number of LD Teachers: 2

Other Support Personnel: Special Education: 1 EMH; 2 TMH; 2 MH; Learning Center Teacher

Our Integration Efforts:

No major change in program in response to REI at this time. Current program judged successful. Currently, students are mainstreamed to the extent appropriate.

Date We Began Our Increased Integration Efforts for LD Students: See above

Motivating Factors: See above

- Increases in the number of students to be served has encouraged use of integration to the extent appropriate over the years. No recent changes.

Goals:

- To decrease the size of LD self-contained classes
- To provide LD students with a variety of activities; instructional and social

Preparation for Increased Efforts: System-wide activities have been offered over the years and regional courses have been provided by UVA. Self-contained LD teachers talked with parents and held meetings with special education administrators. Special education teachers met with general education teachers and followed standard procedures for changing placements, where appropriate.

Initial Staff Reactions: Several individuals believe that the forces behind increased integration efforts are impractical and do not consider the preparation and workload of general education teachers. Some support the integration movement and others fear that regular education teachers "will be spread in too many directions." Teachers are also concerned that increased integration will result in scheduling conflicts and inadequate student services. They foresee limited opportunities for joint planning.

Impact on School Resources: Current system utilizes personnel and instructional space effectively.

Impact on Policies/Operating Procedures: Existing practice deemed successful; no recent change in policies or procedures.

Planning for Integrated Instruction:

Extent/Schedule: Current practice allows for planning between general and special education as student needs arise.

Perceived Adequacy: Overall, more joint planning time would be beneficial. One respondent stated that planning time is adequate but not "ideal."

Instructional Roles in Integrated Instruction:

4?0

General Education Teachers: In one situation where the LD resource teacher goes into a general education classroom one period per week, the general education teacher provides most of content area instruction and works cooperatively with the LD teacher.

LD Teachers: The LD teacher who co-teach in the general education classroom makes sure that the students stay on task and assists the general education teachers as needed. Within the current program, LD teachers consult with general education teachers concerning the academic and behavioral needs of the resource students in the general education classroom.

Aides/Others: The Learning Lab teacher assists general and special needs students with classroom assignments and initiates lessons of her own while students are in the lab.

Typical Instructional Adaptations in Integrated Classrooms: Within the current program structure, teachers make use of a variety of adaptation including:

- Reduced expectations
- Shortened assignments
- Access and use of lower level materials
- The provision of opportunity to use artistic ability or oral skills
- Group work
- Use of instructional games
- Use of computers as instructional tools
- Oral reading of tests, etc.

In-School Availability of Service Options for LD Students:

-Resource program is available
-Mainstream monitoring option is available

Observed Impact of Increased Integration Efforts:

Impact on LD Students: There has been a more positive attitude toward learning and school. The mainstreamed students seem very satisfied with their placement. They are more socially accepted now and have had more academic success in the classroom.

Impact on Staff: Overall, staff members are satisfied with their current service delivery system. They are concerned that general education students will lose valuable instructional opportunities under an increased integrated system,.

Overall Impressions of Increased Integration Efforts for Serving LD Students:

Program Strengths: (Of Current Program)

- Strong and caring faculty
- General education teachers willing to make modifications for LD students
- LD students now involved in general education program; increased competitiveness and reduced stigma

Program Weaknesses/Continuing Needs:

- More planning time needed between special and general education teachers
- Workload is great
- Some classrooms are overcrowded
- Need additional for addressing special needs in the general education classrooms

Unrealized Goals: (Of Current Program)

- Desire to increase all students' awareness of what it is like to have a learning disability
- One respondent would like to see more students pass the sixth grade literacy passport test

Recommendations for Replication Elsewhere:

- Be sure the proposed changes are going to truly be an improvement for students
- Avoid changes simply for change sake. Develop and improve programs over time

Exhibits (If any):

451

Exhibit N

Summary of *In-Class* Observations Completed During the Follow-up Field Visits[1]

Site	Obser vation	Nature of Class Observed	Instructional Method	Instructional Personnel	Instructional Role	Same Lesson	Adaptations	Other Observations
Bedford County Schools:								
Liberty HS	1	Social Studies	Teacher directed whole group with small group work	Classroom teacher	Leader	Yes	No	Real-life problem-solving activity involving all students
				LD teacher	Support			
	2	Biology	Teacher demonstration with individual seat work	Classroom teacher	Leader	Yes	Yes	Hands-on activities to facilitate identification of skeletal parts
				LD teacher	Support			
Otter River Elementary	1	Reading/Math/Writing	Teacher directed small group: oral reading	Classroom teacher	Leader	Yes	No	Used manipulatives and color coded
					Support			
	2	Reading	Teacher led discussion: whole group	Classroom teacher	Leader	Yes	No	Oral reading of text material
				LD teacher	Support			
	3	Math	Teacher led demonstration and discussion: whole group	Classroom teacher	Monitored & reviewed	Yes	No	Used manipulatives to support math lesson; chalkboard demonstration: fractions
				LD teacher	Leader			

---

[1] Visitation sites selected by hosting system.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Fairfax County Schools: Chesterbrook Elementary	1	Language Arts	Teacher led discussion; computer-assisted instruction	Classroom teacher	Monitored & reviewed	Yes	Yes	Error detection chart used to support English lesson; students shared letters composed
				LD Teacher	Leader			
	2	Language Arts/Reading	Teacher led discussion: whole group	LD teacher	Leader	Yes	Yes	Introduction to Beatrix Potter; content, Peter; Rabbit; paper bag puppets used for reinforcement
				Aide	Checking papers			
	3	Language Arts	Teacher led demonstration and discussion: whole group	Classroom teacher	Monitoring	Yes	Yes	Use of pattern words to facilitate and generalize learning
				LD teacher	Leader			
				Aide	Monitoring; observing			
	4	Science	Teacher demonstration; peer teaching; cooperative learning	LD teacher: Heterogeneous group	Leader	Yes	Yes	Employed multi-media (e.g., audio tapes, overhead projector, school to school computer linkage for science project); class/community project
				Aide	Support			
	5	Reading	Seat work; individualized instruction via reading conferences	Classroom teacher	Leader	No	Yes	Used reading response sheet to focus & engage students; use of story frame for book reporting
				LD teacher	Support			

4'4

Cardinal Forest Elementary	1	Special Science	Teacher-led demonstration; whole group; seat work	LD teacher	Leader	Yes	No	Combination high risk students, ESL, and LD students combined
				Aide	Support			
	2	Social Studies	Teacher-led discussion; whole group and peer groups	Classroom teacher	Leader	Yes	No	Divided class with LD teacher to reduce size. Used peer teaching in pairs.
				Aide	Monitoring			
	3	Social Studies	Teacher-led discussion; individual seat work	LD teacher	Leader	Yes	No	Research on knighthood; used word bank for LD students
				Aide	Support			
	4	Language Arts/Reading	Individual instruction by teacher and aide (small group reading)	LD Teacher	Leader	No	Yes	Computer assisted instruction being used to individualize small group teaching for reading and language
				Aide	Support			
Hanover Public Schools:								
Cold Harbor Elementary	1	Physical Education	Teacher-directed skill development (small group/individual instruction)	Classroom teacher	Support	Yes	No	Teachers shared lead teaching responsibility; integrated self-contained LD class with regular class
				LD teacher	Leader			
	2	Reading	Teacher led small group	Classroom teacher	Leader	No	Yes	Small group reading (alternative assignment; LD students paired with non-disabled peers to facilitate learning
				LD teacher	Support			

Roanoke City Schools:

Oakland Elementary	1	Reading	Teacher-led discussion; whole group	Classroom teacher	Leader	Yes	No	Whole language instruction; used oral reading with chalk board for discussion
				Aide	Observing			
				LD teacher (part-time during period)	Individual assistance			
	2	Language Arts	Teacher-led discussion/demonstration (whole group)	Classroom teacher	Roles interchanged	Yes	No	Use of multi-modal materials and teaching strategies; higher order thinking skills used in discussion
				LD teacher	Roles interchanged			